# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. — Without Concealment—Without Compromise. — EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS.

VOL. XII. NO. 47. — NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1852. — WHOLE NO. 619.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 Nassau street, New-York. Terms, Two Dollars per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & Johnston, printers.


## Selections.

### THE COMPROMISE MEASURES.

### SPEECH OF HON. J. R. GIDDINGS, UPON

*The several Acts of Congress which constitute the Compromise, including the Fugitive Slave Law.*

Delivered in the House of Reps., March 17, 1852.

The House having resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the Deficiency Bill (Mr. Meade, of Virginia, in the chair),

Mr. Giddings said:

For the manner in which these political questions are now precipitated upon the House I feel no responsibility. From the commencement of our session I have endeavoured, so far as able, to guide the business of this body in the regular and appropriate channels marked out by our predecessors in the earlier and better days of the Republic. I endeavoured, by all the influence I could command, to take up the President's message in the first months of the session. On examining that document, all parties could have brought forward their views. I will also add, that I regretted to hear the gentleman from Georgia, who has just taken his seat, boast in this Hall of the price of human flesh at the South. It appeared to me that this was not the place for such declarations.

Sir, on the morning of the first day of this session, one of the great political parties of this body, in caucus assembled, resolved to sustain the Compromise measures of the late Congress. The other, assembled in like manner, laid similar resolutions on the table. The support of these measures was a subject of agitation and discussion, before we had proceeded so far as even to ballot for a Speaker; and few days of the entire session have passed in which a portion of the time has not been occupied by such agitation.

The Compromise I understand to consist of a series of laws, enacted by the late Congress, consisting, first, of the law which admits California as a State. The object of that bill being accomplished, no attempt to disturb it will of course be made. Secondly, that which defines the boundaries of Texas. This, too, has accomplished its object, and is therefore settled, and no longer a subject of controversy. The others, establishing Governments in our Territories, excluding the slave-breeders of Maryland and Virginia from the slave markets of this District, and that for the recapture of fugitive slaves, are in operation—subject, like other statutes, to modification or repeal. But it is said that all questions of Slavery were settled by the passage of these laws; that they are to operate as a final *quietus* of the whole Slavery agitation. These ideas were not advanced in this body at the time those bills were passed. Indeed, if my recollection be correct, there was no discussion upon the passage of the fugitive law, or the laws establishing Governments in Utah and New Mexico. They were passed under the previous question, without examination. Few members of that Congress, I think, entertained the absurd notion that their action could bind the action of gentlemen now present. Few members from the free States, who voted for these measures, have survived the storm of popular indignation, brought upon themselves by the passage of those laws. Their successors were sent here for the very purpose of repealing these enactments; and I am of opinion that it will require strong argument to convince them that the reprehensible conduct of their predecessors is to control and govern this Congress.

I am aware that men in high official stations have announced to the country that the slave questions are settled—that all agitation has ceased. But what are the facts? We see and know that discussion has increased and extended more rapidly since the enactment of those laws than at any former period.

Our elections are very generally made to depend on the slave question. It has placed new and able members in the Senate, and it has driven others into retirement. It has occasioned great changes in this body. Where now are the Northern members who advocated these Compromise measures? Gone, sir, most of them, to that land of political forgetfulness from which they will never return. What questions entered into the late contest in New Hampshire? What were the issues in Massachusetts at her late autumnal election? What has occasioned the political revolution in Ohio? These elections turned upon the question of Slavery. And while on this point, I would ask what has blasted and withered the last political hopes of the present Secretary of State? Every man knows that it is this very question of Slavery. While he has been writing letters and making speeches to demonstrate that the slave agitation had ceased, it was operating in the popular mind, was silently stealing his political breath, and has now pronounced the sentence of death to his political hopes. In most of our elections for State and county officers, it is rapidly becoming the principal disturbing element. The people in some portions of the country will not confide in those who are the advocates of freedom, in other parts they will confide in no other.

The institution of Slavery has increased its victims, in sixty years, from six hundred thousand to *three millions*.

The slave States, early finding themselves unable to hold their bondmen in subjection called on the Federal Government to assist them in recovering their fugitives from their neighbours the Indians. Without discussion, or, so far as we know, without obligation the Executive power, then, as usual, in slaveholding hands, effected a treaty providing for the return of fugitive slaves to their masters. This constituted a precedent. Another similar treaty followed. The Indians failed to live up to their stipulations. The sending of their fellow men back to chains and bondage was a barbarity at which they revolted. At length the first Seminole war ensued. Then the second; and untold millions of the people's money was squandered in returning them to bondage.

Slavery and the slave trade, in this District was established early in the present century; and in a few years thereafter, Congress established the coastwise slave trade. As the institution increased more slave territory was demanded. Louisiana was purchased; then Florida. Texas was annexed. War with Mexico followed, and vast territory was acquired. Three million slaves could not be held in bondage by the power of the slave States. We were called on to permit the institution to be extended into our Territories; we did so; to give free territory to Texas; and we did it; to pay her for territory which our arms had conquered; and we did it; to take upon the nation the burden of capturing and returning fugitive slaves; to appoint officers, or slave-catchers, in all parts of the free States; to subject the citizens of the North to the expenses and disgrace of chasing down the hunted fugitive, as he flies from a land of chains and sighs, and bitter tears. The people of the free States have witnessed these things. They know them to be unconstitutional—violations of their rights—inhuman and barbarous. They, of course, understand that the remedy is with themselves, and they are endeavouring to cast these burdens from them. *And they will do it.*

Looking forward as all reflecting men must, we see that in sixty years more we shall have 20,000,000 slaves in the United States—a greater number than our present white population. Now, sir, if this Federal Government is to take upon itself the burden and expense of holding that vast number of human beings in bondage; if we are to appoint officers to catch all who shall hereafter attempt to regain their freedom, and to pay the expenses of returning them to bondage; if we are to provide territory for them, and to maintain slave markets for such a population, we shall find ourselves involved in business which may well occupy our whole time at no distant day.

For three years past, this body has done very little except to legislate for Slavery. But what else can it do, when that institution shall be three times as great as it now is? Sir, this agitation will increase as Slavery increases, unless this Government shall respect the constitutional rights of the free States, and relieve them from the burdens, the disgrace, and the crimes, of that institution.

I have so often discussed the constitutional rights of the several States respecting Slavery, that I now feel no disposition to repeat the doctrines on which I base my political action; but I may be permitted to say, that Congress has no more right to bestow its energies for the support of the Slavery of the South than it has to sustain their banks, their railroads, or their system of apprenticeship, or the laws of those States respecting minors, or those which regulate the rights of husband and wife. Slavery, with all these subjects, are matters which each State should regulate for itself, and with which this Government has no right to interfere, and with which we cannot interfere, except at the expense of the constitutional rights of the North.

To this view of our constitutional obligations, both the great political parties of the nation are committed. I need only quote the resolution of this House in December, 1838, which is in the following words:

"That this Government is a Government of limited powers, and that, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the institution of Slavery in the several States of this Confederacy."

This resolution was introduced by a distinguished Democratic member, and was sustained by a vote of 198 yeas to 6 nays; nearly every member of both parties voting for it. The Baltimore platform contains resolutions substantially embracing this doctine; and now the entire Democratic party of the nation stands pledged before the world to maintain this important right of the people of each State, to maintain just such an attitude, in regard to Slavery, as to them shall appear just and reasonable. Such, too, were the positions of the Whig party, generally, up to the passage of the Compromise measures, to which I have referred. Indeed, the Whigs were more strongly committed to this policy than were the Democrats. The *free* Democracy at Buffalo adopted this great leading principle of State Rights, as the basis of their organization. But the distinction which marked that party as separate from both the others was, and still is, a determination to bring into practice this important doctrine, upon the maintenance of which the liberty and the rights of the people depend; while both the other parties have, practically, deserted their professed and avowed principles.

To the maintenance of the Compromise measures as a *final settlement* of the slave question, the President, in his message, exhorts the people to adhere. The Whig and the Democratic parties are each striving to go beyond the other in their devotion to this plan for silencing all further agitation of the questions of Liberty and Slavery. The Whigs, at the commencement of this Congress, apparently got the start of their competitors in servility. They passed resolutions, pledging their party to the support of the Compromise. And here, in this Hall, certain leading members publicly boasted of the fact, before we had even commenced the election of our officers. I do not say that the whole Whig party were present at the caucus, but the act has gone forth as the act of the party. Those individuals who were present evidently thought that servility to the Slave Power was the only means of securing political success. But we are given to understand, by leading Democrats and by the press of that party, that their National Convention will do that which their Congressional caucus refused to do, by passing resolutions, pledging their party and their candidate to maintain the Compromise measures. On the other hand, we are now told that the Whigs will play dark; that they will make no avowal of principles, but will select as their standard-bearer a gentleman of acknowledged military renown; will spike his cannon, take the flints from their own muskets, and go forth to the conflict without music, but with the silence of a funeral.

And now, Mr. Chairman, the question comes home to every elector of this nation; to every man, woman and child, whether bond or free. *What will be the effect of maintaining the Compromise?* What the effect of silencing further agitation of the slave question? These are important inquiries, which, as yet, have never been answered; nor have they been discussed in this body.

The first consequence resulting from the support of the Compromise will be to *maintain Slavery and the Slave Trade in this District.*

As already observed, in 1801, Congress passed a law, by which the institution of Slavery in this District, with its attendant commerce in human flesh, was continued and established under Congressional enactment. That law remains in force to this day. Here, sir, under our own observation, within our own jurisdiction, by virtue of our own laws, man is degraded, robbed of his intellectual enjoyments, kept in deplorable ignorance, and disrobed of his manhood. By virtue of those laws he is transformed into a chattel, brutalized, and sold like swine. Here, sir, men and women are bred for market. Beings in human shape follow the business of rearing boys and girls for sale; and by that business sustain themselves and families, and accumulate wealth.

To sustain the Compromise is to sustain this revolting practice—to give these slave-breeders license and encouragement to pursue an occupation abhorrent to every feeling of Christianity and of decency. Yet, sir, the Whig members of this body, on the first day of our session, resolved, distinctly and emphatically, to support this practice, which is spurned and held in disgust by Mahommedan Governments. I wish to be understood, and therefore repeat, that the support of the Compromise measures is identified with, and inseparable from, the support of slave-breeding and slave-dealing, now carried on in this District. To sustain the Compromise is to sustain these practices. To prohibit the slave trade here would violate this pretended Compromise. It is required, I understand, of each of the Democratic candidates for President, that he shall sustain the Compromise, and thereby lend his whole official influence to uphold and encourage the breeding and sale of slaves in this District. Unless pledged to this, he cannot receive the support of that party; while the Whig candidate is to say nothing about it, to express no opinion in regard to it, to stand neutral upon the subject. To stand neutral, to do nothing, is to lend an influence in favour of this growing human flesh for market. This traffic in the bodies of females depends on the voice of Congress. If we say stop, it ceases forever; if we are silent, it continues. To remain supinely silent, is to continue it.

Now, I do not think there is a member on this floor from a free State who dare speak out boldly and say to this House and to the country that he is in favour of this breeding of mankind for market, that he approves of this traffic in God's image. If any member from the free States should do it, I think it would seal his political fate. Yet gentlemen do not hesitate to rise here and declare their intention to support the Compromise, thereby lending their entire influence to sustain this business of breeding human cattle for the shambles. I respectfully ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brooks], who first publicly swore allegiance to this Compromise, whether he is in favour of sustaining this traffic in human flesh? I desire to understand the position of gentlemen, and hope they will stand up manfully and avow their doctrine and their policy. I therefore respectfully ask the gentleman to say what he will do in regard to this slave trade? Will he vote to continue or to abolish it? I await his answer.

Inasmuch as that gentleman remains silent, I respectfully ask any other Northern man, who sustains the Compromise, to say whether he is willing to sustain this traffic in human flesh? I repeat, that I understand the Compromise to embrace this slave trade; that if we sustain the Compromise, we must sustain this traffic. And I desire to see gentlemen stand up, like honest, honourable men, like the Representatives of freemen, and avow their sentiments; and if there be a Northern member who will avow himself in favour of this traffic, in the face of this House and of the country, I desire to hear him, and I await a response.

But, inasmuch as I have been addressing Whigs more particularly, I will also inquire of gentlemen on the other side of the House on this point. I noticed the letter of the gentleman from New Hampshire to his constituents, alluded to by the gentleman who preceded me. I understand that he considered himself pledged to support the Compromise. I should like to know whether he will sustain the slave trade in this District?

Mr. Hibbard. I voted for the bill of the last Congress abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia. That vote explains my views on that subject. If the gentleman wishes to know whether I would vote for a bill abolishing Slavery in the District, or the trade between the people of the District, I answer that I should vote against it. I am opposed to the further agitation of the subject.

Mr. Giddings. I thank the gentleman for his frankness. I understand him, and the country understands him. I was mistaken in supposing there was no man from a free State who would sustain this commerce in the bodies of women and children. But I like to see a man bold, even in his iniquities.

I have more respect for the gentleman who thus says what he will do, than I have for members who refuse to speak, but cast their votes and exert their influence to maintain this slave trade. I presume the gentleman honestly represents the views of his people, that they approve of this breeding of men and women for market.

But the Compromise embraces also the slave trade upon our Southern coast. All are aware that, by the ninth section of the act of 1807, slave dealers are authorized to carry (under certain regulations) slaves from one port of the United States to another, under the flag of our Union. Men, women, and children, are purchased in this District, and in the Northern slave States, and placed on board these slave ships and carried to the torture and premature deaths, which, it is well known, await them upon the cotton and sugar plantations. There they are murdered under a slow torture by the lash of inhuman overseers. It is estimated that twenty thousand human victims are thus annually sacrificed to Southern barbarity. The blood of those victims rests upon the members of this body. We have the power to stop this flood of human gore. But, while these victims toil in chains, and sigh and weep under the tortures to which our law consigns them, members here refuse to examine this subject, refuse to permit the introduction of a bill to repeal this law; but they stand here and exert their utmost powers to revive, to galvanize into life, the old party issues on which they have heretofore contended. They endeavour to close their eyes to notorious facts, and soothe their consciences by occupying their own attention, and that of others, upon the miserable party conflicts, which have no higher motive or aim than to secure the spoils of office to one or the other political party. I judge not for others, but so far as I am myself concerned, I should feel far less guilt were I to strike a stiletto to the heart of a single victim, than I should to exert my influence to sustain that slave trade, or than I should were I to sit here in silence and permit that infamous traffic to continue without my solemn protest against it. It is frequently the case, that men and women, apparently doomed to the tortures of the far South by this trade, commit suicide rather than meet its horrors. All will recollect the story of the father, mother, and children, confined in a slave prison in a neighbouring State, destined to the Southern market. The parents, having deliberated upon their situation and that of their children, took the lives of their own offsprings, and then sought death by their own hands. Do not we who sit in this Hall, and by our silence and inaction continue this slave trade, share in the guilt of these dark and damning iniquities? Does not the blood of those victims stain our garments? And, when we appear at the bar of final retribution, shall we plead this Compromise as a justification for crimes which would strike terror to a savage heart? I am aware that some of my colleagues have pledged themselves to sustain these Compromise measures, thereby upholding this slave trade. Now, sir, I wish to inquire of those gentlemen whether they are willing to rise on this floor and say frankly to the people of our State, that they are in favour of supporting this slave trade? I desire a full and fair understanding on this subject. I wish to understand the position of the Whig party of my own State. Will they sustain this coast-wise slave trade, or will they not? or are they to play dark and keep silent? I mean no disrespect to my colleagues of either party. I am solicitous that the people of Ohio should understand how each of their representatives stands on these questions.

The people of the North have been deceived long enough by politicians, who proclaim their intention to sustain the Compromise, without descending to particulars and explaining what they mean by such support. Indeed, gentlemen dare not avow their intention to sustain the slave trade in this District, upon our Southern coast, and in our Territories, and to maintain the infamous fugitive slave law. It was a truism uttered by my Lord Coke, when he said, "fraud lurketh in generalities." This general expression in favour of sustaining the Compromise embraces all these iniquities; and when a man, either here or elsewhere, avows himself in favour of the Compromise measures, he, in substance and fact, avows himself in favour of breeding men and women for market in this District and in our Territories, and of prostituting our flag to the protection of a commerce in human flesh. I would be as willing to traffic in God's image, as I would to sustain the owner of yonder slave prison in his accursed vocation, by upholding the law which authorizes him to pursue it. I would as soon vote for Williams, the slave dealer and owner of yonder barracoon, to the office of President, as I would for any man who sustains him in his execrable commerce. Yet, sir, strange as it may seem, your Presidential candidates of the Democratic party appear to think they will have no chance of success unless they patronize those worse than savage practices, while the Whig candidate is to keep silence in regard to them.

But the Compromise was intended also to, and, if observed, must, forever, close all hope of excluding Slavery or the slave trade from our territories. On this point there is no longer uncertainty. The official returns from Utah show that Slavery exists there. Servile politicians can no longer deny the fact. The honourable Secretary of State, I think, will not repeat that gigantic falsehood which he put forth in the Senate on the 7th of March, 1850, when he asserted that Slavery was "excluded from that country by the laws of God." Indeed, at the time when that attempt to deceive the people of the North was made, it was known here and throughout the country that Slavery existed in Utah. The fact had been published some two months previously in most of our leading newspapers; and if the author of that declaration was ignorant of the fact, I think he was the only member of Congress uninformed on that point. Slavery also exists in New Mexico, as we have seen by the public press. Indeed, if we can rely upon the public press, a Judge of New Mexico was lately engaged in purchasing slaves in this city to work the silver mines of that country, from which the Secretary of State asserted that Slavery was excluded by God's law.

Now, if the Compromise be sustained, then are these Territories to be delivered over to the curse of Slavery. The soil which, under Mexican law, had been consecrated to freedom, is now, under American law, to be cursed with the most degrading oppression that exists upon earth; and slave markets are to be established, and men bought and sold, and women made the subjects of purchase and sale, on territory conquered by our arms. To sustain the Compromise, is to sustain Slavery and the slave trade in those Territories. To vote for Presidential candidates who uphold the Compromise, is to vote for Slavery, for the slave trade, with its attendant crimes, to continue in those Territories.

Mr. Chairman, when I hear members on this floor rise and proclaim their intention to support the Compromise, I understand them to say emphatically, that they have made up their minds to support Slavery in this District and in the Territories; and to maintain the slave trade, with all its crimes and frightful amount of guilt, here, and in the Territories, and on our Southern coast. If gentlemen mean anything by their declarations, they mean this. When they say the slave question is settled, they intend to be understood by Southern men as giving their influence in favour of maintaining Slavery and the slave trade, wherever they now exist under the laws of the Federal Government. I desire the people of the North to understand them. I rose to speak for this purpose. I ever have been, am now, and trust I ever shall be, hostile to political deception and double-dealing. I desire to see gentlemen maintain their opinions at home and in this Hall. I have no respect for that man who will hold one set of doctrines before the people at home, and then lend his influence to overthrow them in this Hall. The people have no respect for such men; nor do I believe that such men have respect for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, who that held a seat in this Hall during the last and present Congress, could listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rantoul], who spoke so frankly and so ably a few days since, and help comparing that speech with the conduct of a certain honourable member from the same State, who, in the last Congress, fled from the Hall in dismay, rather than to give a vote on a pending question, lest that vote would show his constituents and the country his position on the slave question. I care nothing for political names. The people will look at the *man*, and compare him with the *servile*. All men, of whatever party, must approve the course of him who frankly avows his sentiment; and all must pity him who has not the moral courage to give a vote where Slavery is involved.

Sir, I would commend to our Whig friends the example of the gentleman from the old Bay State, who recently spoke so boldly on this question. I greatly desire to see gentlemen on this side of the Hall speak as boldly as he did. I know there are some who hold the same sentiments. I hope they will not hesitate to express them. And I also desire to see all who hold that it is our duty to maintain the Compromise, to lend our influence to the support of Slavery and of the slave trade, come forth, and say so manfully, as becomes men who represent an enlightened people. This expression of our honest sentiments is due to the people; it is due to ourselves. We have been pained at exhibitions of tergiversations here; at the exposure of gentlemen who hold to manly sentiments of freedom at home, and when they once get here, turn round and swear allegiance to Slavery. There is no excuse for this deception. If our constituents desire us to act for Slavery, let us do it openly and boldly. If they wish us to maintain the cause of freedom, let us do it manfully, or resign our seats in this body; but let us not deceive those who honour us with their confidence.

Again, sir, by maintaining the Compromise, we shall uphold the fugitive law, with all its infamous and unconstitutional provisions. The constitutional provisions in regard to fugitives from labour have been so often argued by me, that I will not, on the present occasion, repeat my views. I will only say that a proposition to involve the people of the free States in the expense and disgrace of arresting and imprisoning fugitive slaves, was offered to the Convention that framed the Constitution; that the proposal was objected to; and so strong were the objections, that the member who offered it withdrew it, not daring to take a vote of the Convention. We are all aware that on that occasion no member expressed the opinion that the people of the free States were bound by that instrument, or by any moral or political principle, to participate in the expense or the disgrace of capturing fugitive slaves. We know, historically, that it was the intention of the framers of that instrument to do no more than to secure to the master the same right to pursue and capture his slave in a free State, that he possessed to pursue and capture his horse or mule. That the latter part of this provision, which says "he shall be delivered up on claim of the person to whom such service or labour may be due," renders it our duty to deliver up the stray horse or mule, on claim of the owner. We are not to obstruct the master in reclaiming him. This was the view expressed by the Supreme Court, in the case of Prigg *vs.* the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This is perfectly consistent with the views of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Rantoul), who, I think, has taken the ground entertained at the time the Constitution was adopted by the people in their several State Conventions. But, for the sake of the argument, I will go beyond him, and admit that Congress possesses the right to legislate so far as to secure the owner in the exercise of this right; that we may, by legislation, punish any person who interferes with that privilege, either by making such interference penal, or giving a compensation to the owner. This was the view evidently entertained by the Congress of 1793. They endeavoured to effect this object; but there they stopped. They made no attempt to involve this Government, or the people of the free States, in the burdens, expense, and disgrace, of catching and sending the trembling fugitive back to bondage.

Here, sir, at this precise point, I take issue upon the constitutionality of that portion of the law of 1850 which imposes upon this Government, the burden, expense, and disgrace, of chasing down the flying bondman, and sending him back in chains.

Those portions of the law which authorize and require the appointment of officers to grant process for the arrest of slaves; that part which makes it the duty of judges to grant such process; that part which directs marshals and deputy marshals to arrest the slave; which authorizes them to call on the people to assist in that practical work; which renders it penal for a man to feed a famishing or starving fugitive, by which he shall be strengthened and enabled to pursue his flight—these provisions are each of them unconstitutional, unjust, abhorrent to the principles and the feelings of the people of the free States, inhuman, and barbarous.

Mr. Chairman, it has pleased certain gentlemen, on various occasions, to allude to myself and my political friends as *opposed* to the Constitution. They will not meet our arguments on this point. They recoil from the legitimate debate, and seek to misrepresent us by general charges, carefully avoiding every specific point. I now repeat, that to the full extent to which the law of 1850 involves this Government, its officers, and the people of the free States, in the burden, the expense, and disgrace, of recapturing and returning fugitive slaves, it is *unconstitutional*.

And, sir, I here desire to understand if there be a member from Ohio, or from any free State east of it, who denies this position? Is there one who holds that his constituents and himself are bound to participate in the expense and crime of chasing slaves? If so, I desire that he will announce the fact. I long to find one such public man; and if there be one here, I wish he would avow the fact.

No, Mr. Speaker, I blush for my country, when her representatives take shelter behind unmeaning generalities, and refuse to avow their honest sentiments.

If gentlemen intend to support the Compromise, they must of course intend to chase down the trembling female, as she flees from the inhumanity of a worse than savage oppressor. And, in view of some men, no candidate is fit for President or other office, unless he is willing thus to degrade himself in view of those who regard with sentiments of respect the dignity of the human race.

Mr. Chairman, we are under neither moral nor political obligations to legislate on this subject. The first clause of the same section of the Constitution provides that "the citizens of each State shall enjoy the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States." Now, sir, instead of carrying out this provision of the Constitution, by legislating for its enforcement, we have left the subject as it was when the Constitution was adopted. And instead of enforcing this provision, we permit Southern States now to sell the citizens of Massachusetts into Slavery; and hundreds of native born American citizens have by those States been seized and sold into Slavery, in plain, direct, and palpable violation of the Constitution, and are now bowing under the lash; while members of this body from the same States do not even refer to such outrages upon liberty and humanity, but are eager to rise and swear allegiance to this fugitive law; avowing their readiness to chase down a fellow being who seeks an asylum from oppression. How long will the people tolerate such callousness, such insensibility to all that is right, and just, and patriotic?

Mr. Chairman, for sixty years this construction of the Constitution which I have expressed has been acknowledged and observed. During that period, no statesman advanced the abhorrent doctrine of subjecting the labouring men of the North to the disgrace of catching slaves. The history of our government shows this fact, and coming ages will read it. This law which takes from the labouring men of the North a portion of their earnings, to pay for catching and returning fugitive slaves, is thousand times more repugnant to their feelings than was the stamp act, or the tax on tea. Under this law, they are involved in supporting an institution which they detest; compelled to contribute to the commission of a crime abhorrent to humanity. This oppression, this violation of conscience and of their constitutional rights, this tyranny, they feel and deprecate. It is impossible that an intelligent—patriotic—people can long be subjected to such violations of their rights and the rights of humanity. The conscience of the nation cannot be long separated from its Government. It will be in vain for navy-yard chaplains to deliver lectures, and write essays, to convince our people that it is their duty to uphold the slave trade and the fugitive law. It will be in vain for "ministers of the lower law" to preach up the duty of Christians to commit crimes against God and humanity, at the contemplation of which our very natures revolt. The voice of reason and of conscience will find utterance. The escape of Shadrach at Boston, the just and holy manifestation of the popular mind at Syracuse, the merited death of Gorsuch at Christiana, should teach the advocates of the fugitive law, and of the Compromise, that the "higher law" of our natures, dictated by God, and imprinted upon the hearts of a Christian people, will eventually set these barbarous enactments at defiance. The shooting slaves in the mountains of Pennsylvania, the inhuman murder of a fugitive in Indiana, as stated in the public papers, could not fail to be followed by the resistance to which I have referred.

The slaves, as already stated, are to increase; the number of fugitives will of course increase more rapidly. Our railroads, steamboats, and the vast increase of intercommunication between our free and slave States, cannot fail to carry knowledge and intelligence to the whole coloured population, North and South. With them there must be hostility and hatred towards their oppressors, whether they be slaveholders or the allies of Slavery. It is a law of the human mind. All honest men must unite in the acknowledgement of their rights. It is our duty to carry intelligence to every being who bears the image of our Creator. Thousands of agencies are at work, bearing information to the oppressed and down-trodden of our land.

By an inscrutable law which pervades the moral world, our very efforts to sustain Slavery are converted into the means of its overthrow. The slave trade in this District is upheld for the purpose of sustaining Slavery in our Southern States. But where is the reflecting man, who does not see that every slave sold from this city carries with him intelligence of his rights, and becomes a missionary of freedom when transferred South? Why, sir, in that mournful procession of fifty-two victims of this infamous commerce, taken from this city in 1848, was an individual of unusual intellect. His name was Edmonson. He called on me at different times to aid him in raising money to redeem his sisters. They were, however, sold, and subsequently repurchased by some benevolent people at the East, and are now free. I am told that his whole family were endowed with intellects of the highest order. He was himself, so far as propriety of language, gentlemanly deportment, and intelligence, are concerned, not the inferior of gentlemen here, or of the President of the United States. But he was a victim to this slave trade; and unless he now sleeps in a servile grave, he is preparing the minds of Southern slaves for that work which lies before them; a work which, if not accomplished by the voice of truth and justice, will be perfected in blood. That, too, is the case with every fugitive slave who is returned to bondage. The whole Northern slave population are becoming intelligent. They read, or hear read, the discussions of our Northern press. They learn what is said in this Hall. The remarks I am now making will reach the ears of many thousands who are borne down by oppression. To them I say, "*All men are created equal;*" "*you are endowed by your Creator with an inalienable right to liberty;*" and I add the words of one of Virginia's noblest sons, "Give me Liberty, or give me Death."

Mr. Chairman, the day of redemption for this people *must come*. No human power can prevent it. All reason, philosophy, and history, demonstrate the approach of that day. Look at the British West Indies. There the African for centuries laboured under the scourge; they clanked their chains; they toiled and wept under the hand of oppression. But they increased in numbers, as do the slaves of our Southern States. Their oppressors became enervated by indolence and luxury, while the slaves increased in numbers, in knowledge, and in power, precisely as do the slaves of this land, sarcastically called a land of *freedom*. They became an expense to their Government, as do ours. That expense increased, as ours does, until the Government had no other course than to purchase them and set them free. The same result is intended by those who now advocate the Compromise, which is nothing more nor less than an attempt to throw the burden of sustaining Slavery upon this Federal Government. As was well remarked by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rantoul], it is a *Federal* measure, a centralizing measure, calculated to concentrate power in this Government, and to destroy the influence of the States. The plan has often been hinted, and this day it is more than hinted, in the leading organ of the Administration of this city. The grand scheme will subject the nation to a debt of $1,200,000,000—a debt one third greater than that of England—a debt that to an indefinite period will weigh down the labouring men of this nation, cripple our energies, and bring upon us the oppression, the suffering, which now render the English peasantry the subjects of pity throughout the civilized world. The Compromise is but the incipient step to this final consummation. If we are now willing to subject the funds of the nation to sustain this institution, if we silently submit to this Compromise, I assert, without hesitation, that a proposition to relieve ourselves from this burden, by the purchase of the slaves of the nation, will be made within the next five years. I therefore say to the labouring men of the North, of all parties, your constitutional rights, your liberties, are in danger. To pay $1,200,000,000 would, however, be far less degrading to the Northern character than this fugitive law.

Sir, gentlemen here strive to get up old party issues. Who does not know that those issues have become obsolete; that they cannot be galvanized into life? Who now contends for a national bank? Who opposes the sub-treasury? These issues have been surrendered by the Whigs. The Democratic party no longer contends against harbour and river improvements. There will be no more proceeds of the public lands to divide among the States. There is no longer any issue of principle in regard to the tariff. The Whigs ask no more, than that the revenue to sustain Government shall be raised by a tariff of duties, so adjusted as best to promote the interests of our own labour. To this the whole Democratic party of the North assent. There is no longer any party who goes for free trade—for supporting Government by direct taxation. I would myself be willing to try this method, as it would soon abolish the Slavery of the South; but no political party is in favour of that system; all agree upon the principles of a tariff, but differ as to the amount which shall be assessed on various articles.

Why, sir, for three years the parties have been unable to arrange themselves upon any issue, whether it be the tariff, or any other of the old questions which divided the Whigs and Democrats. Nor can those issues ever again become interesting. They have become obsolete by force of circumstances. While these issues have been fading away, the great and overshadowing questions of humanity have been increasing, strengthening, and extending throughout the nation. It has entered into all our moral and political questions. It is discussed in our social circles, our political conventions, and our pulpits. It controls our County and State elections, our elections of members of Congress, and our Presidential elections. It occupies the attention of our State Legislatures and of Congress. Europe sympathizes with us in this great work. The question of a man's right to his life and liberty now occupies the attention of the civilized world. It has thrown Europe into commotion. Her people, her statesmen are discussing it. It has taken an undying grasp upon the conscience, the judgment of this people. The agitation will go on, until this government shall be redeemed and regenerated from oppression, until the stain of Slavery shall be wiped from our national escutcheon.

Let me assure gentlemen that a noble band of patriots, of philanthropists, are now labouring to bring about this "consummation so devoutly to be wished." Upon the broad basis of truth, of justice, of equal rights, of the brotherhood of man and of nations, we have taken our stand. Our numbers are increasing. The effects of our labours are becoming manifest. Our cause is advancing. Our moral and political influence is extending, and our final triumph is certain. We have no hostility to any party. Our contest is waged against oppression in all its forms—against tyranny and usurpation. Nor will we cease our warfare, until victory, rendered glorious by results that will reach forward to man's remotest existence, shall crown our toils——

[Here the hammer fell.]

### RESOLUTIONS.

*Adopted by the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society (England), on the 13th November, 1851.*

The members of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society have observed, with deep concern, that the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society has taken no steps to redeem itself from the following grave charges, which have been brought against it in the London *Morning Advertiser*, the Bristol *Examiner*, and various other papers both English and American, as well as at several public meetings:

*First*—That the general course of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society has been one of unfaithfulness to the interests of three millions of slaves in the United States of America.

*Second*—That it omitted to take any action in anticipation of the visits of American pro-slavery clergymen to England, until it was compelled to follow the current of popular feeling, which had been created during the previous three months by other less influential associations; and,

*Third*—That it subsequently claimed to have originated the Anti Slavery measures taken in this direction by different religious bodies, though many had been *adopted* before it put forth any *recommendation* of them.

*Fourth*—That, although thoroughly aware of the real character and *merely nominal existence* of the 'American *and Foreign* Anti-Slavery Society,' it has persisted in demanding for *that Society, exclusively*, the support of British Abolitionists.

*Fifth*—That it has studiously concealed from the public the unceasing exertion and great achievements of the 'American Anti-Slavery Society,' excluding from the *Reporter* all notice of its proceedings, and declining to insert, even as advertisements, any resolutions of sympathy with its labours, or any appeals for aid to its annual Bazaar.

*Sixth*—That it has taken no notice, in the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*, of the most remarkable series of Anti Slavery meetings ever held in the United States, at which George Thompson, Esq., M. P., recently addressed vast numbers of the American people, with singular eloquence, faithfulness, and success.

*Seventh*—That it has assiduously kept back from the readers of the *Reporter* accounts of interesting and important public meetings, held in different parts of the kingdom, to welcome those able and distinguished representatives of their brethren in bonds, William Wells Brown and William and Ellen Craft; and has neglected and discouraged fugitive slaves bearing high testimonials from leading members of the American Anti-Slavery Society, while commending to the sympathy of the British public such as are patronized by the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

*Eighth*—That for the last eleven years, some of its most active members, without rebuke from the Society, have industriously circulated sinister reports, prejudicial to the character and influence of some of the most virtuous, high-minded, and intrepid American Abolitionists, while the *Reporter* has been closed to all statements calculated to remove such misapprehensions; thus evincing a want of candour and magnanimity utterly unbecoming the professed friends of the slave.

Wherefore, perceiving that the influence exerted by the British and Foreign A. S. Society has tended to repress energetic action, to withdraw English sympathy and aid from the true Abolitionists of America; and that, by multiplying the obstacles with which these devoted friends of freedom have to contend, it has grievously retarded the Anti-Slavery Cause throughout the world—the members of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society feel that this body has forfeited the confidence formerly reposed in it, and that their duty to the slave requires them to dissolve all connection with it.

And it is hereby resolved,

That this Society be no longer considered as an auxiliary to the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, but that it constitute an independent organization, to be governed by such regulations as shall hereafter be determined upon.

That the members of this Society consider it incumbent upon them to direct the attention of all other affiliated associations to the grounds of their separation from the parent Society; and that a copy of the above resolutions, and of the printed documents on the subject already in circulation, be sent to the Secretary of each auxiliary.

F. N. Tribe, *Secretary*.

### AMERICAN SLAVERY.

A Lecture upon this subject was delivered by the Rev. Ed. Matthews, of Wisconsin, at the schoolrooms of Counterslip chapel, Bristol, on Friday evening, 13th March, at the request of the committee of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society.

The object of the Lecturer was to show the injurious influence of the slave power upon the free States of America, upon churches and ministers of religion, and upon missionary and other religious societies, and the means by which British Philanthropists and Christians could aid in removing the evil. Mr. Matthews showed how Slavery, when, in 1620, it had obtained a footing in Virginia, rapidly diffused itself among the colonists. The Puritans in New England, the Dutch in New York, the Scotch in Georgia, the Fins and Swedes in Delaware, the Quakers in Philadelphia, were all included in the crime. Through the elevating influences of the Gospel, the Northern States came to the conviction that "slaveholding was a sin," and abolished the system. The Southern States, however, yielding to no such sentiment, retained and multiplied their slaves. But the evil effects of slaveholding was not confined to the South; not a village nor a hamlet in the North was exempt from its power. The North was controlled by it ecclesiastically, politically, commercially, and socially. In speaking of its operation upon the religious bodies generally, Mr. M. stated that the churches at the North being united with those at the South, are thus brought under the slaveholding influence of the latter. The Episcopalian churches had 1,504 ministers, and 73,000 members holding 88,000 slaves. Now the Southern bishops justified Slavery as a heaven-ordained institution, and the Northern bishops approved of the doctrine either orally or by silent acquiescence. The other ministers, and the Episcopalian press, were in full harmony with the bishops. Mr. M. knew not of a solitary exception among the clergy. Judge Jay, however, a layman among the Episcopalians, had boldly rebuked the slave power. The Baptists numbered 8,010 ministers; 948,869 members; their slaves were 226,000. The slave power ruled this body chiefly through the missionary organizations. Mr. M. then gave a history of the "Baptist Triennial Conventions," into which slaveholders having gained admission, on the plea of their benevolence, required the Northern men to sign a paper, agreeing to treat them as good Christians. Many did so; and for 21 years out of 30, slaveholders held the office of Presidents of their body. Their missionaries planted slaveholding Christian churches among the Indian tribes of America, some of these Indians holding over a hundred slaves, and their presses were pledged to silence on Slavery. The Methodists number 6,000 ministers; 1,250,000 members, and hold 219,563 slaves. The slaveholders required all Northern ministers to be silent on Slavery, on pain of expulsion from their body. Mr. M. adduced numerous examples of the almost omnipotent influence of slaveholders over this body. In 1844, the conference ventured to cast a slight censure upon Bishop Andrews for holding slaves; at this the slaveholders were indignant, and rent their church in twain; but as 4,000 members, who hold 67,000 slaves, remain with the Northern division, little hope is to be entertained of their doing anything to abolish Slavery. The Presbyterians were next described as having 4,578 ministers, and 490,250 members possessing

77,000 slaves, and as being equally, with the other sects, subservient to the slave power, sacrificing to church union, purity and humanity. As an evidence of that, the very prayers in the South must be conformable to the mandate of Slavery. Mr. M. referred to "Letters on American Slavery," just published by Mr. Lant Carpenter, an English Unitarian minister, who, when doing duty for Dr. Gilman, of Charleston, South Carolina, laid aside, at Dr. G.'s request, a prayer he had selected, containing the words, "We would remember those in bonds as bound with them," which Dr. G. assured Mr. Carpenter would be dropping a spark on gunpowder. "Had Wm. Gilman," Mr. M. remarked, "been in the habit of preaching the Gospel faithfully to his congregation, they would not have required the Bible precept of 'remembering those in bonds' to be expunged from their prayers to the Almighty." Mr. Matthews next noticed some of the sections of American churches who had seceded from the main body from a conscientious repugnance to union with those who aided in the maintenance of Slavery. All who are denominated "Wesleyan Methodists" in the United States have separated from the Methodist Church upon Anti-Slavery grounds. The "Free Mission Baptists" (by whom Mr. M. was delegated to visit England) seceded from the "Baptist Triennial Convention;" and the "Free Presbyterians" have left the great Presbyterian body in obedience to the claims of the slave upon the professed followers of Christ. All those bodies (with some others which he must omit on the present occasion from want of time to describe their exact position, though he had much to say about them) made it a cardinal principle to treat Slavery as a *sin*, and to have no fellowship with slaveholders. It was in this way only—by this Anti-Slavery action in the religious bodies—that the churches of America could become purified of the iniquity of Slavery. It was not a military force that sustained the system, for among 23 millions of people they had but 10,000 soldiers: it was not by help from neighbouring powers, for they were all opposed to Slavery; it was by *public sentiment alone* that the iniquity was maintained. It was in the power of the church to change their sentiment, but she refused to do so, and on her rested the guilt of American Slavery. Mr. M. then rapidly described the slaveholding influences which were exerted upon visitors to the United States, and to which those who had any public object to accomplish invariably submitted. Father Mathew was not allowed to visit the Southern States until he had given the slaveholders reason for believing that he had repented of having formerly signed an Anti-Slavery address to his countrymen in America. Jenny Lind was forced to let it be understood that she had no sympathy with the Abolitionists. Kossuth, the professed apostle of freedom, thought it necessary for his mission utterly to ignore three millions of American subjects in abject Slavery. Even Miss Bremer, the Swedish writer, was induced to commend the "Colonisation Society"—the slaveholders' project for expatriating the free coloured people! Mr. M. next explained how all who were hostile to Slavery in the United States were exposed to persecution, and he entreated the churches of England to lend their countenance and aid to those of their brethren in America who were battling against this gigantic evil. It had long been the aim of the slaveholders to prevent this sympathy from being extended to the Anti-Slavery party in America, and they sent pro-slavery ministers to this country to mislead public opinion upon the Slavery question. Mr. M. trusted that the Christian people of England would not suffer themselves thus to be blinded and deceived. In concluding, Mr. M. said he would just allude, though with no intention of re-opening the subject, to the course he had pursued at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in Bristol, some time ago. He felt himself constrained, as an Anti-Slavery missionary, not to omit such an opportunity of communicating information to the members of that alliance as to the points in which their organization was impeding the Abolition movement in the United States. Nothing was further from his intention than to be guilty of any discourtesy to that body: his conduct had been misinterpreted, but he trusted that eventually credit would be given to him for only acting agreeably to his convictions of duty. He had counted the cost before hand. He was aware that any attempt to introduce the Slavery question into the Alliance would not only subject himself to odium, but would operate injuriously upon one part of his mission—the collecting of funds in aid of the Anti-Slavery purposes of the "American Baptist Free Mission Society." But he also felt that however large an amount of pecuniary help he should carry home to his Society, if it were obtained by a compromise of the slaves' interest, the Free Mission Baptists would cry out with one voice, "*Send back the money.*" When referring to the secession of the Free Mission Baptists from the general body, Mr. M. explained that they took the appellation of Free Mission, to indicate their Anti-Slavery character—their constitutional separation from all missionary and other religious organizations that were contaminated by Slavery. They published at first a very small paper, but now a large weekly one called the *American Baptist*. Their Society employs a number of agents who have travelled through the free States, visiting the churches in the agricultural districts, villages and cities, every where lifting up their voices against Slavery; calling conventions, lecturing, distributing Anti-Slavery works, and writing for the public eye. Besides these strictly Anti-Slavery labours, the Society have established schools in Canada for the instruction of Fugitive Slaves, about 25,000 of whom have fled thither to escape the horrors of American Slavery.

At the close of the lecture, Mr. Estlin proposed that the audience offer their cordial thanks to Mr. Matthews for his deeply interesting and instructive address, and also to the committee of the Bristol and Clifton Anti-Slavery Society for inviting Mr. M. to lecture. Mr. M. had alluded to some odium which had been cast upon him by the course he took when the Evangelical alliance held their meeting in Bristol. Mr. Estlin was acquainted with every step of Mr. Matthews' conduct on that occasion, and was satisfied that Mr. M. acted from a sense of duty to the slave's cause, and had in no single point been guilty of any impropriety, though it was probably owing to his having been misunderstood and misrepresented at that time that Mr. M. had, with much delicacy, avoided all reference to one of the objects for which he was delegated by the Baptist Free Mission Society to visit England, namely to collect funds for their various Anti-Slavery purposes. Mr. Estlin trusted that one who had been so long devoted to the Abolition cause, and who had nearly been murdered in consequence of his fidelity to it, would not be allowed to leave Bristol without carrying with him some pecuniary testimony from those who professed great interest in the cause, of their sympathy in the labours of the American Baptist Free Mission Society.

Mr. Hudson seconded the proposition, and thanks were given by acclamation to Mr. M., and to the Anti-Slavery Society Committee.

The room was well filled, and the lecturer listened to with earnest attention.—*Bristol (Eng.) Gazette.*

Slavery.—The following tables from the *Milwaukie Wisconsin*, show pretty conclusively the relative value of the institutions or domestic Slavery and universal freedom. Arkansas and Michigan were admitted together; they are of the same age, but of vastly disproportioned growth. In Manufacturing and Agricultural progress, the free State trebles the slave one, while in moral growth and social elevation, no comparison can be made.

*Census of Michigan*—1850.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dwelling-houses in the State, | | 71,616 |
| Families in the State, | | 72,611 |
| Whites, | 395,097 | |
| Coloured, | 2,557 | |
| Total Population, | 397,654 | |
| Farms in cultivation, | | 34,089 |
| Manufacturing establishments producing annually $500 and upward, | | 1,979 |

*Census of Arkansas*—1850.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dwelling-houses in the State, | | 28,252 |
| Families in the State, | | 28,416 |
| Whites, | 162,068 | |
| Free coloured, | 589 | |
| Total free population, | 162,657 | |
| Slaves, | 46,982 | |
| Total population, | 209,636 | |
| Farms in cultivation, | | 17,758 |
| Manufacturing establishments producing an annually $500 and upward, | | 271 |
| Federal Representative Population, | | 190,849 |

Origin of Newspapers.—Mankind are indebted to Queen Elizabeth and Lord Burleigh for the first printed newspaper, which was entitled the *English Mercurie*. The earliest number is still in the British Museum Library, and bears the date of July 23, 1588. In the reign of Anne, there was but one daily paper, the *Daily Courant*. The first provincial journal in England was the *Orange Postman*, started in 1706, at the price of one penny. The earliest Scottish newspaper appeared under the auspices of Cromwell, in 1652.

# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

**** All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

*††† Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* Francis Jackson, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1852

## EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, will be held in the city of Rochester, on Tuesday, May 11th, at 10 o'clock, A. M., and will continue through the two following days.

Further particulars hereafter.

William Lloyd Garrison, Pres.

Wendell Phillips, Sydney H. Gay, } Secretaries.

## *HORACE PRESTON.*

This unfortunate victim of our republican tyranny is reported as safely delivered by young Tallmadge into the hands of his former master; or rather he was given up by the deputy Marshal, on his arrival at Baltimore, into the custody of the man-thief, Martin. This man, it will be remembered, is the New York Policeman, who first feretted out the poor fellow, kidnapped him, and then delivered him over into the hands of his accomplice Busteed, but who during the trial was nowhere to be found, his party thinking that his agency in the affair was best kept out of sight as long as possible. He was "in at the death," however, at the close of the hunt, ready to hand the game over to its claimant and receive his reward for his share in the infamous business.

What that share is, does not yet appear. The man who says he owns Preston offers to sell him for $1,500. Of this sum he asks $1,100, as the value of the man, and $400 as the expense of his recovery. That amount he has paid to somebody. The expense of the return to Baltimore, Busteed took good care should be saddled upon the government, so that there has been no chance of spending anything except in fees to the Commissioner, the Counsel, and the Catcher. The job, we think, was done dog-cheap, and ought, in the common course of trade, to lead to new transactions. Hitherto the expense and the difficulty of recovering a fugitive has been considered, both North and South, a great obstacle in the way of the usefulness of the law of 1850. There has never been any difficulty in finding a Commissioner and Counsel, ready and willing enough to do all that was required of them; but as there has always been a public sentiment behind them, in some degree, hostile to the law, there has also been some difference to that feeling. Not till now have Commissioner and counsel had the hardihood to do a great deal more than was required, and who have shown their readiness to deliver up anybody as a slave—provided that he is coloured—to anybody who chooses to claim. Certainly Morton and Busteed should be encouraged by their Southern friends.

## *IMPORTANT DECISION.*

The Supreme Court of Missouri has recently decided a case, in relation to slaves who have been voluntarily taken by their masters from slave to free States, in direct opposition to what has heretofore been considered the doctrine of the Common Law in such cases. It is thus reported:

It appears that the late Dr. John Emerson, surgeon in the U. S. Army, owned a slave, named Dredd Scott, whom he took with him at different times in free territory, whither he was ordered, and where he was stationed, remaining at different times four years in free territory. After the decease of his master, Dredd brought an action against the administratrix of the estate, to recover his freedom, on the ground that the laws of the free States and territories, to which he had been taken by his master, entitled him to his freedom. The court instructed the jury that, if they were satisfied that Scott had resided, with his master's knowledge and consent, in free States and territories, as alleged, he was entitled to his freedom. The jury accordingly returned a verdict in favour of Scott.

The defendant moved for a new trial, on the ground of the misdirection of the court. This being refused, the widow, who was administratrix, sued out a writ of error, and the case was brought before the Supreme Court of Missouri. In this court, Judge Scott presiding, and Judge Rayland concurring, the judgement of the lower court was reversed, and the case remanded. The ground taken by Judge Scott, in his decision, was, that the States, so far as their municipal concerns go, are foreign to each other; and the laws of one State can have no effect in any other State, except so far as a spirit of comity may exert an influence; and this influence should depend on the conformity of such laws to the institutions of a sister State. But a State was not bound to carry into effect enactments conceived in a spirit of hostility to her own laws, as were the enactments of free States concerning slave property.

The Court conceived that such a concession to the laws of the free States as had been given by the State Court in this case, would subject Missori to the greatest inconvenience and loss of property, surrounded as she is on three sides almost, by free territory. While, therefore, it was conceded, according to Chancellor Kent, "to be a principle of public law, requisite for the safe intercourse and commerce of mankind, that acts, valid by the law of the State where they arise, are valid everywhere, it is, at the same time, to be understood that this principle relates only to civil acts founded on the volition of the parties, and not to such as proceed from the sovereign power. The force of the letter cannot be permitted to operate beyond the limits of the territory, without affecting the necessary independence of nations." 2 Kent, 117, 8.

There was no evidence in the case before them that the master of Dredd inended to manumit him, or considered him entitled to his freedom in consequence of his residence in a free territory; and the fact that Scott had not availed himself of his position while in a free territory, and had voluntarily returned to his master's house in a slave State, cut him off from all benefit from his master's act in taking him into a free State. For, argued the Jugde—

"In States and Kingdoms in which Slavery is the least countenanced, and where there is a constant struggle against its existence, it is admitted law, that if a slave accompanies his master to a country in which Slavery is prohibited and remains there a length of time, if during his continuance in such country there is no act of manumission is decreed by its courts, and he afterwards returns to his master's domicil, where Slavery prevails, he has no right to maintain a suit founded upon a claim of permanent freedom. This is the law of England, where it is said her air is too pure for a slave to breathe in, and that no sooner does he touch her soil than his shackles fall from him. The case of slave, Grace, 2 Haggara Adm'rl'ty Rep. 94.

"Story, in his 'Conflict of Laws,' says it has been solemly decided that the law of England abhors, and will not endure the existence of Slavery within the nation; and consequently, as soon as a slave lands in England, he becomes, *ipso facto*, a free man, and discharged from the state of servitude; and there is no doubt that the same principle pervades the common law of the non-slaveholding States in America—that is to say, foreign slaves would no longer be deemed such after their removal thither. But (he continues) it is a very different question how far the original state of Slavery might re-attach upon the party, if he should return to the country by whose laws he was declared to be and was held as a slave."—Sec. 95, 6.

The decision of Judge Scott overrules several cases which have been previously decided by the Supreme Court of Missouri.

The *Boston Courier*, a paper fond of garnishing its columns with ornaments of this sort, publishes the following letter from the notorious John H. Pearson, the man who seems to have been sent into the world to do certain things, in this day and generation, which no man, unless officially created for the purpose, would have ever done. That he should not at all apprehend, poor fellow, the nature of those acts is, of course, absolutely necessary, for such misapprehension must be a characteristic of the man who could condescend to commit them. That he should misapprehend some other things as well, is to be expected. He is evidently greatly flattered by the notice that is taken of him, as some criminals are vain of the attention and interest they excite, as they are led out to public execution. Famous and notorious are synonymes with this Pearson. He is satisfied to be talked about, though no man should ever speak of him but with execration and disgust. He is best described by a word coined a few years ago, by an illiterate but shrewd negro, who wished in one word to depict a character which was at once notorious and atrocious, and in being the last was anxious to be the first also. It was, he said, *notrocious!* We can not better designate this man, than as the 'notrocious' John H. Pearson. Here is letter:

TO WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Sir—I was attentively honoured by the receipt of your speech at Faneuil Hall, of January last, and more recently have received from some unknown source, a pamphlet containing the same, with the yearly doings of the Anti-Slavery Society. I certainly must think that I am considered to be a person of some consequence, since I have received so many repeated marks of kindness and attention from you and your friends, and from the use of my name in your speeches and in your publications, and I fear my sense of vanity may be inflated by my being elevated, through your efforts, above the humble position which I have occupied for thirty years.

I had hoped that some one of the fifteen hundred State street and Milk street merchants whom you allude to in your speech, would have made some response to your charitable remark, that you hoped they "would all become bankrupt." What a philanthropist you must be, what a degenerate scion from a noble stock! What would your honoured sire say with regard to such language and such sentiments, if he could speak from his grave? It is true that nothing can be expected of you, personally. You were born surrounded by wealth, and you have never been required to apply yourself to any occupation whereby you might earn a dollar for your own comfort or necessity; and it is not known that you have ever done anything for yourself in the strife for human existence, which almost every man has to enter into—unless you have been paid for traducing your less fortunate fellow-citizens in your lectures and speeches. If such a calamity as you allude to and desire, should befal the merchants of Boston, it might be an instructive and salutary lesson to you, should the patrimony which you have inherited from your fathers be sunk in the downfall which you so devoutly implore. You might then be made to know and feel how hard it is to earn your bread by honest labour; and either sawing wood, drawing a hand-cart, or working in paving the streets, would be more respectable employment for you, than lecturing an excited company, and persuading them to disobey their country's laws.

You, Mr. Phillips, and your associates, denounce a law of the land which you are opposed to, and counsel resistance to it. In what situation would you be, while denouncing and libelling your neighbours all arouud you, if you were not protected by the law? You sneer at and denounce the Judges who administer the law which protects you in all your intemperate proceedings, because they pass under Marshal Tukey's chains, placed around the Court doors to keep out a mob, while, if such an excited assembly, raised on the other side, was allowed to rush into your meetings, and act the part which your mob would have acted at the Court House, if they had not been restrained, that is, if any thing but an Abolition mob could be imbued with the spirit and extent of Abolition vengeance, your heads would hardly be safe on your shoulders.

You ask, "What would my children give, twenty years hence, to blot out that single record of sending back a man into Slavery?" This you know to be false, for the person never was out of Slavery. He was taken back according to the law of the country. Here I stand, and it is immaterial to me what my children may say; and all I ask is, that they may stand on their own merits, and not lean on their fathers's good or bad qualities.

Twenty years hence, if any one asks your children what their father's occupation was, they might reply, "*Agitator, Calumniator*, a *Traitor* who denied the laws of his country." This language will apply not to you alone, but to your Anti-Slavery associates, to *Sumner*, and all others, who deny the laws, yet may be said to *perjure* themselves by taking and swearing to the oath to obey and support the laws and constitution of the United States.

But, I intended merely to acknowledge your courtesy, or that of your friends, in keeping me advised as to your opinions; and bid you adieu, with the hope that such evil as you wish may fall upon fifteen hundred of your fellow-citizens, may be averted from them, and that you may find better occupation, whether it is necessary for you or not, than the wholesale slander and denunciation of that portion of the community whose trade is in merchandize, and not in philanthropy.

Respectfully, &c., Jno. H. Pearson.

The Maine Law.—In the Legislature of this State, the Maine Law is defeated, though the vote in favour of it is a strong one. The Yeas and Nays were as follows:

Ayes—Messrs. Babcock, Bailey, Benedict, Bennett, Billings, Bradley, Bradford, Cole, Coburn, Dutton, Ellsworth, Fisk, Ford, Gilbert, Hartshorn, Hayden, Haner, Hartfield, E. C. Hart, Hedges, Hoyt, Holt, Humphrey, Hurlburt, King, Lawrence, Lake, Oakely, Pettit, Pierson, Richards, P. W. Rose, Rouse, Albert Rowe, Shoecraft, Simmons, A. Smith, Stevens, Tallman, Valkenburgh, Welden, Wheeler, Williams, Yeomans, Youngs—45.

Nays—Messrs. Berry, Bedell, Blackstone, Blood, Brown, Butler, Bull, Castle, A. Chamberlin, J. B. Chamberlain, Clark, Copeland, Cuddeback, Cushing, Davis, Delong, Donnan, Elwood, Emans, Freer, Gallup, Gale, Gibson, Gray, Hatch, Herrick, Hover, Howes, Hutchins, Johnson, Keyes, Keese, Luckey, Lyon, Martin, Merritt, Miner, Mills, Monroe, Moloney, Moss, O'Keefe, Osterhout, Palmer, Richmond; Riley, Rollin, J. Rose, Sayles, S. S. Smith, Sornberger, Speaker, St. John, J. B. Stevens, Steele, Stillwell, Swift, Taylor, Underwood, Van Etten, Van Santvoord, Van Vechten, Walsh, Ward, Webb, White, Wright—69.

Absent or not voting—Messrs. Corser, Cortelyou, Demarest, Harper, Milliner, Norton, Perry, G. B. Rowe, Sanford, Sheldon, Benj. Smith, Wesbrook, Wilson—13

RECAPITULATION.

| | Whigs. | Opp. | Total. |
|---|---|---|---|
| For the Law | 32 | 12 | 45 |
| Against the Law | 24 | 44 | 69 |
| Absent | 6 | 7 | 13 |
| | 64 | 62 | 127 |

Messrs. Corser, G. B. Rowe, G. Smith, Perry, and Wilson, asked permission, by unanimous consent, to record their votes in favour of the bill, on Saturday, but were refused, Mr. Walsh objecting.

In Connecticut, the friends of the Law have done no better, if not worse. The Locofocos have chosen their ticket in the State Election, which, in this case, is considered by both parties as a triumph of Rum.

In the Election in Maine, the Law seems to be sustained by public sentiment in the smaller town and rural districts; but in Portland, Neal Dow has lost his re-election as Mayor, and, though his opponent is pledged to sustain the Law, his election is said to have been secured by Rum Money.

Rhode Island is claimed by a correspondent of the *Tribune*, as four majority in the new Senate, and fourteen in the House, for the Law.

A Noble Act.—A Cincinnati paper says that the late Mrs. Ware, of Frankfort, Ky., by her will, emancipated her slaves—thirty in number—and not content with giving up that which in Southern markets would command from $15,000 to $20,000, purchased for them 1300 acres of good land in Ohio, and lying on the Miami canal. Twenty-seven of them arrived recently in Cincinnati from Frankfort, in charge of the executor of the estate of their late mistress. They were purchasing wagons, agricultural implements and stores for their new home, for which they were to leave immediately.

Generous Donation.—The Salem (Ohio) *Bugle* says that a gentleman and his wife have placed at the disposal of the Executive Committee of the Western Anti-Slavery Society property to the value of eleven hundred dollars, to be devoted to the dissemination of Anti-Slavery principles in the West. The *Bugle* is not permitted to give the names of the generous donors.

The Slave Trade.—A letter from Matanzas, under date of the 28th ult., says that the American brig Hanover, landed eight hundred slaves on the island a short time before, having been brought from the coast of Africa. The Hanover was fitted out in the port of New York for the Slave Trade, and the attention of the authorities was called to the fact at the time, but no notice was taken of it.

——The Maine Law has passed the Minnesota Legislature, with a proviso submitting it to the direct vote of the people. The vote throughout the territory was to have been taken on the first Monday in April, and if favourable, the law goes into force on the first of May. Thus, we see the extreme West rising with the East for the suppression of the worst evil that ever afflicted mankind.

——Mrs. Emily Norton, wife of Hart Z. Norton, of Norwalk, Ct., died in New Haven, a few days since, from the effects of chloroform which was administered by Dr. Park, preparatory to performing a dental operation. She had last year taken chloroform administered by the same physician in the same manner, without any injurious effects. At the Coroner's inquest it was proved that but half a drachm of chloroform was used, and that it was administered at the earnest request of the deceased. Dr. Park was exculpated from all blame.

## REPLY TO DR. PEABODY.

BY WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH.....NO. III.

ALL MEN NOT CREATED FREE.

"For my part, I think half this republican talk sheer humbug. It is the educated, the intelligent, the wealthy, the refined, who ought to have equal rights, and not the canaille."—*Uncle Tom's Cabin.*

Dr. P. rejects the notion that man has an absolute right to freedom, and confounds the very plain distinction between natural and social rights.

"If there are circumstances under which Slavery has many compensating advantages, it is equally true that, as men gain self-control and rise above the level of savage life, Slavery hinders the progress which at an earlier stage it may have helped. And here is its true evil. The great wrong does not arise out of the fact that every man possesses an absolute and perfect right to freedom. What are termed abstract rights are nearly all of them subject to great limitations and qualifications. Rights imply duties; social rights imply corresponding duties to society; and he who has no ability to perform the duties, has no just claim to the rights. So long as one is incompetent to perform the duties of a freeman, he has, properly speaking, no right to be free. But, on the contrary, there can be no greater wrong than that of which they are guilty who, for selfish ends, make use of superior power to prevent him from becoming competent to the duties and rights of freedom (Slavery in U. S. p. 7).

The absolute rights of man, says Blackstone, are those which are given him "by the immutable laws of nature" (1 Comm p. 124), and "which every man is entitled to enjoy, whether out of society or in it" (Ib. p. 123). Among these rights, and next in importance to life itself, he places the right of personal freedom. "The first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals. Such rights as are social and relative, result from and are posterior to the formation of States and Societies; so that to maintain and regulate these, is clearly a subsequent consideration, and therefore the principle view of human laws is, or ought always to be, to explain, protect and enforce such rights as are absolute * * and then such rights as are relative" (Ib. p. 123).

The law knows no clearer distinction than this between natural and social rights. Reason points out none which is established on a juster basis. God, not society, gives man his nature. God, not society, makes it his duty to perfect his nature. God, not society, then, gives him those rights, the enjoyment of which are necessary to enable him to fulfil his duty—the accomplishment of the end of his being; and pre-eminent among these is the right to freedom; for without freedom to cultivate his moral and intellectual faculties as far as possible, how can a man perfect himself, or become what God intended? And yet, this plain, unmistakeable distinction Dr. P. confounds. He talks about a man being incompetent to enjoy freedom, and says that such persons have no right to be free!

He may, however, say—that natural rights are subject to some limitations in a state of society. This is true. The right to liberty is God-given, because its enjoyment is necessary to enable us to become what God intended we should be—men. Still, within certain limits, society may *regulate* the enjoyment of the right. But it can never, however, destroy it. The true end of society, its own professed object, is the common good of all; that is, the accomplishment by *all* its members of the purpose of their existence; and this can only be done by securing to all *alike* their natural rights as fully as possible. The distinction between mere regulation of the natural right to freedom, as in the case of minors, and insane persons, or even the temporary deprivation of it as a punishment for crime, and the earlier annihilation of the right, as in the case of slaves, is just, clear, and unmistakeable. In the former cases, the end of the law is the advancement and well-being of the child or insane person; whilst in the latter, the end of the law is the profit of the master. No persons have laid down this distinction with more clearness than the Supreme Court of North Carolina (State vs. Mann, 2 Rev. Rep 263). With the single view of helping the individual, society may, as in the case of children, regulate the enjoyment of the right to freedom; but it can never deprive him of it, except by way of punishment for crime.

But, waiving all these considerations, if the right to freedom is, as Dr. P. seems to think, a mere social right, the necessary conclusion is, that some individuals may be rightly enslaved; and Dr. P. proceeds to state who these individuals are. He seems to think that it is rather a duty than otherwise to enslave savages and those persons who are wanting in self-control, because Slavery will help the progress of such persons. Thus he says "as men gain self-control and rise above the level of savage life, Slavery hinders the progress which at an earlier stage it may have helped. And *here is its true evil*. The great wrong does *not* arise out of the fact that every man possesses an absolute and perfect right to freedom." The entire consistency of Dr. P.'s ideas on this subject is remarkable. Then he has no notion of being considered an apologist for Slavery—not he! And yet, in the same breath, he lays down the fundamental principle that some persons may be rightly held in Slavery! and declares that those of the slaves who are incompetent to perform the duties demanded by society of freemen, have no right to be free! In Southern ears, this will sound like preaching that the continued enslavement of the blacks is a positive duty! He is right in thinking that his essay will be generally acceptable to the South; we only wonder that he should have any misgiving about its meeting with favour from the disciples of Mr. Calhoun. It is true that some parts of it, when separated from the context, have a very decided Anti-Slavery turn, but the attempt to show the fallacy of the Declaration of Independence was Mr. Calhoun's darling effort. We cannot but think that Dr. P. is wholly mistaken in his fears on this point, and that among his warmest admirers will be found some of Mr. Calhoun's disciples.

But let us test his theory a little. Savages, he thinks, may be rightly held in Slavery, in order that they may be taught habits of self-control. Now, he means to tell the truth when he declares that he is no apologist for Southern Slavery. But he would be an apologist if he considered the slaves savages, because then it would be right in his eyes to enslave them. Therefore, he does *not* consider them savages of such stuff as slaves may be made of. But if a race of men, who, as we have seen, are sunk in the deepest ignorance, who practice perpetually the most debasing vices, who, in their religious notions, are strictly heathen, and who can only be made to work by the "excitement of Slavery," are not such savages as it is right to enslave, where will you find such savages? No where, we hope, on God's earth! and Dr. P.'s theory falls to the ground for want of objects to apply to.

It may be said that Dr. P. considers the native Africans as much more degraded than our slaves; that they are "mere savages, and of the most degraded kind." Why, then, does he not hasten to urge on the colonists of Liberia the duty of enslaving these native savages in order thereby to civilize them? And yet he actually states it, as one of the good results of colonisation, that "the scattered settlements from Sierra Leone to the San Pedro have already annihilated the slave trade along that extended line of coast, which was formerly the favourite resort of the slave traders" (p. 21). Looking through *his* spectacles, we can see no cause for this congratulation. Why should not the native Africans, most degraded savages as they are, enjoy the civilizing influences of Slavery? Why should it be a matter of joy that they are prevented from being placed under the restraints and excitements of Slavery, which cannot fail to result in so much good to them? The mere fact that Dr. P., like any other humane man, rejoices, in spite of his theory, that the Slavery of the native Africans is prevented, shows that he thinks it wrong to enslave even them. But here again, what becomes of his theory if savages of the most degraded kind are not savage enough to be rightly made slaves of?

He may, perhaps, say that it would be right for the Liberians to enslave the native Africans, in order to civilise them, if they did not possess better means to accomplish the same object; that they have other means of educating them, and instructing them in religion and the arts, without the necessity of reducing them to Slavery, and therefore it would be wrong to do so. But if the state of Slavery is not wrong *per se*, it affords one way by which to impart civilisation, even though it may not be the most expedient; still, we do not see that the Liberians would do wrong to adopt it. They have a choice of means, both of which are right. They may exercise their judgment as to which is most expedient.

But there is still another fatal difficulty with Dr. P.'s theory. It is simply absurd to talk of teaching a man habits of self-control by enslaving him. Self-control is one of the noblest and rarest of virtues. He alone possesses it in perfection

——— who reigns within himself, and rules
Passions, Desires and Fears.

Does Slavery teach the slave to control his passions or desires? No! It bids him let them loose! Does it teach him to lay aside all fear? No! Its very foundation is base unmanly fear! What lesson in *self*-control does he receive who is wholly controlled by the will of others? What habits of self-reliance can he learn who relies on others for every thing? This is one of the very greatest evils of Slavery, that it converts a man into a chattel. As well talk of the self-control of the horse as the self-control of the slave. Do they not both obey the whip?

We agree, therefore, with Dr. P. himself, in thinking that his theory is radically unsound. He lays down a theory, and then, unknown to himself, declares it inapplicable to any class of men to be found on the earth! He thinks that Slavery is right for the very reason why it is most wrong!

# Domestic Correspondence.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. C.

The Argument.—*The Roman Numeral—Curiosities of Compassion—The Correspondent on his own Immortality—His opinions of the Readers—He compareth himself with the Worthies—He is modest as to comparative edification—He discourseth of Books and Reading—He glorifieth 'Skip'—Monetary and Moral Fermentations—The Suffolk Bank—Its character and system—The defalcation there—Lola Montez in the Public Schools—Moral Ebullition—Thomas Sims and Lola Montez, the camel and the gnat—A little editor's ears boxed—Sigma again in the field, the Champion of Virtue—The School Committee and Mr. Emerson—The Correspondent on the New Inquisition—He goeth for Women's Rights—His opinions on Moral Teaching—He committeth Scandalum Magnatum—And abuseth the Munsters—His opinions of Lola Montez as a Moral Teacher, &c., &c.*

Boston, April 5th, 1852.

Just look at the Roman Numeral that surmounts this letter, as a crest bestrides a coat of arms! Do you know what it stands for? A hundred letters! Only think of it! It is very natural that your compassion should be most strongly moved, in view of this phenomenon, towards your readers. Mine, on the contrary, is far more deeply stirred towards myself. I pity myself most sincerely when I consider the incredible pains I have bestowed on those compositions. Their immortality was not very protracted, to be sure, expiring, as it did, within the week. Nor was its subjects coextensive with the Civilized World. For though the readers of the *Standard* are composed of the most intelligent, best informed and most rightly judging of the species, they do not yet amount, in numerical force, to an absolute majority of the human race. Still, however, perhaps my number of readers is about as great as that of most literary, moral, philosophical, and theological works (with the characteristics of all which various styles my letters have been adorned and diversified), of greater pretensions. I will take an even bet (or would, if I ever did such things), that as many persons have read my letters as have perused the Works of the late Rev. Dr. Chalmers, in ten volumes (more or less), or of Dr. Leonard Woods, in about as many, or as will read those of that eminent slave-catching saint (who fortified that Christian virtue at once by the commandments of the Decalogue and example of the Apostle Paul), Moses Stuart, of Andover, when they are launched, as inevitably they will be, at the devoted heads of mankind. Far be it from me to express any opinion as to the class of readers which have, or may, derive the greatest edification from their respective studies. I merely speak of the probable comparative number of the actual *bona fide* readers of these several instructors of mankind.

The ephemeral nature of newspaper writings is not unfrequently a topic of regret. It seems a pity that so much ability as is expended on the newspaper press throughout the world, but particularly in England and this country, should be so wasted and lost. But is it wasted and lost? It is ephemeral enough, to be sure, in its influence; but is it much more so than those productions of the brains that are bound up in books? Newspapers are read by everybody, but how many people, in comparison, read books? Let any one who has a small library of two or three hundred volumes about him, consider how many of even those chosen companions he habitually consults. I don't speak of the forests of books to be found in public libraries, from which the adventurous poacher chops off here and there a branch or a twig to make up his own particular faggot. How many books, even of those that are most in men mouths, are read more than once? And a newspaper is read at least as often as *that*. Are there not a good many people exactly in the predicament of Mrs. Pendennis, who "*said* she liked Shakspeare, but *did n't*"? How many people have read the Paradise Lost through, from end to end? And so on and so forth. The fact is the number of the readers of books is much smaller than we are apt to imagine, especially those of us whose chief trade and business in life has been reading them. And even of the books that are read, how many are read with a hop skip and jump, by the arguments of chapters and the running captions of pages? Blessed be the man who inventeth what we used to call in our Circulating Library days, "Skip"! How could the teeming myriads of the press be encountered without it? But this is not what I began to write about. The moral of the whole is, however, that a man who writes for the papers, has as fair a chance for readers and for influence upon them, though not, perhaps, for permanent reputation, as if he had written books. Is there any contemporary author, even Dickens himself, who has had as many readers or influenced as many, as the late Captain Sterling, of the *Times*?

I have not much to tell you of any happenings since I wrote last. There have been two slight fermentations, one in the monetary, and the other in the moral, world. The first was occasioned by the discovery that something had been going wrong in the Suffolk Bank, which, as you know, is the chief regulator of all our Banking system. As its credit and reputation stood at the very top of the financial scale, both for importance and solvency, it was an uncomfortable circumstance to find that peculations or embezzlements of some sort had been going on for an indefinite length of time, on the part of some of its officers. One of the suspected parties was arrested, on board the Cunard Steamer, as you may have noticed, in New York, by a most singular and, if not borne out by events, a most unauthorized procedure on the part of some of your policemen. The suspected defaulter, or the one secured (as the other effected his escape), is now in jail awaiting his trial, which will soon bring out the facts of the case before the public. Any calamity to the Suffolk Bank would be a public misfortune, under the present system of New England Banking. Its system makes the bills of all banks in New England a currency of equable value, as long as the Suffolk Bank is content to redeem them at its counter, and prevents any remote bank from flooding the market with paper, virtually irredeemable because the issuing Bank cannot be got at for the specie. It, in fact, makes all banknotes, which are redeemed by the Suffolk Bank (and none others would be received as money) of equal current value with Boston bank notes, because both the one and the other can be cashed in State Street.

The event which has shaken, as with an earthquake, the moral repose of Boston, has been the visit of Mademoiselle Lola Montez, or Mrs. James, or Madame la Countesse de Landsfelt, or Mrs. Heald, or whatever title please her ear, to the public schools of Boston. Now it seems that this eminent person, whose talents nobody I believe denies, had a laudable desire to visit those ancient institutions, and on making the usual application, was treated in the usual manner. She visited three of the schools, and certainly showed that she was quite as well qualified to judge of them, as most people who visit them, foreign or domestic. But no sooner was it known, than the moral virtue of Boston was in a blaze of indignation. The city that had kidnapped Sims could not endure the polluting presence of an Opera dancer of whom Common Fame (who is often a Common Liar) had said very hard things, in its school houses! It had gulped down the camel, without so much as a wry face, and was now entitled to strain horribly at this poor little gnat. The little editor of the *Transcript* edified the tea-tables of Boston with his opinions; which brought him a great box on the ear from the fair hand of the lady, a day or two after. She evidently had been read up for the occasion, for she put in the *licks* on the very selected *raws* of the little man. He has said nothing more, in person. But the invulnerable Sigma, strong in his unimpeachable virtue, and entrenched in a house which justifies him in throwing the first stone, or any quantity of stones, at the windows of any offender of this kind, pursued the fight. Whether she will condescend to give him, also, a drubbing, remains to be seen. But, perhaps, she will not venture on so unequal a contest, and he will go his way unmolested.

"Wrapped in his virtue and a warm surtout,"

The Committee-man (Mr. Frederick Emerson) has been also called over the coals by his fellow-committee-men, and put the matter on the grounds of universal custom in like cases, and the absence of any custom for first investigating the moral character of visitors to the Schools.

I am not disposed to stir the question as to the preliminary inquisition which should be made into the moral character of visitors to our public schools. Only I hope it will be extended to *men* as well as to women. I am a thorough-going Woman's Rights man, as to *that*. Neither do I propose to shiver a lance in defence of the fair fame of this particular distressed damsel, at this present time. Though I don't think she is the worst human creature of celebrity, in the country, neither. But I do say, that as for my children, and the schools they go to, are concerned I had very much rather have them exposed to the presence, aye and to the teaching, too, of the fair (even though frail) Countess of Landsfeldt, than to those of many a man before whom Boston editors and School committee men would bow down and worship. I should regard the sight and the speech of her as much less likely to demoralize the young than those, for example, of the Hon. Daniel Webster, the Hon. Rufus Choate, George T. Curtis, Esq., the Rev. Dr. Sharp, the Rev. Dr. Dewey, the Rev. Dr. Waterbury, the Rev. Dr. Barrett, the Rev. Dr. Church, the Rev. Dr. Taylor, the Rev. Dr. Spring and an infinity more of Honourable Ministers and Reverend Doctors, who maintain the political and religious duty of maintaining a system which compels, by law, half the women in half of the States to the life which is the main accusation brought against Lola Montez. *She* would never teach them, as these honourable and holy men do, that offences against morality may become duties, if men only agree to commit them and to stand by one another in them! She would never attempt to destroy the very rudiments of natural morality, as they do! No; even if the sins of this woman be as great as her enemies declare them to be (and it should be remembered, she pleads not guilty, and puts her accusers to the proof), I do not think there are more than half-a-dozen pulpits here, and I am sure there are not as many in New York, that she is not better qualified to fill, as a teacher of morality, than their present incumbents. Which opinion I leave you to digest at your leisure.—D. Y.

## *LETTER FROM G. B. STEBBINS.*

Formation of a State Anti-Slavery Society at Rochester.

Rochester, N. Y., April 3d. 1852.

*Editor Anti-Slavery Standard:*

Dear Sir—You have doubtless seen in *Frederick Douglass' Paper* an account of "the formation of a New York State Anti-Slavery Society"—a few words in regard to the matter, and some reasons why many of us cannot unite with that association.

For some time previous to the meeting of March 18th, a call had been published in *Douglass' Paper* for an Anti-Slavery Festival and Convention, signed by several ladies, members of a Sewing Circle in this city; in that Call *no mention was made* of the formation of a State Society. About two weeks before the time an editorial suggestion from Mr. Douglass urging the Abolitionists to form such a Society appeared, and this limited and unofficial suggestion was the only public notice given.

Of course, no general gathering of Abolitionists of the State could *possibly* be had under such circumstances. How much pains was taken, by private letters, to induce individuals to attend, I know not: but I know well that some of the best, most faithful, and long-tried Abolitionists received no such notice. But few were present from beyond the limits of our county, and we feel that a Society formed at such a meeting can hardly be called a *State* Society.

The Festival and Convention was held in Corinthian Hall for two days, the sale of articles and refreshments from the tables occupying the day, and speeches from the platform a part of the evenings. The afternoon of the first day, those interested in the formation of a State Society were called together. Mr. Douglass said that the great need was for an Association for the regeneration of public sentiment by the presentation of Truth; not a political organization, but a moral movement, in which all Abolitionists of either sex could act and aid in changing the hearts and awakening the consciences of the people (the exact position, as you will see, of the American Anti-Slavery Society). A Committee was chosen to draft a Constitution and report the next morning; as Mr. Douglass states in his paper, the report was prepared by Wm. Goodell, and it needed no such information to see in it the marks of his pen. During the discussions—occupying most of next day—which ended in the adoption of the Constitution, from one to two hundred persons were present to take an active part or an interest as listeners. At the commencement of the discussions, Stephen S. Foster moved that the Society be made auxiliary to the American Society, since its object seemed the same; and if so, it would be best thus to show union and sympathy.

It was suggested that his motion be withdrawn until the Society was formed, and he at once consented. Several articles of the Constitution declaring slaveholding sinful, making it wrong to vote for or give religious support to slaveholders or their apologists, declaring prejudice of colour wrong, &c., were passed with little debate. One article, embodying Wm. Goodell's peculiar views of the nature of law, called forth remarks *pro* and *con* at some length—it reads as follows:

"It is impossible that slaveholding can be either sanctioned by Divine Law, *or made legal by any human governments*, constitutions, statutes, or judicial decisions," agreeable to the well-known and fundamental maxim of Common Law recognised by the Supreme Court of the United States and the Court of King's Bench in England, that "enactments contrary to *fundamental morality* are void." Mr. Foster and others opposed this on the ground that it was a test to which it was well known many faithful Abolitionists could not subscribe. A defence, earnest and decided, was made by Mr. Goodell. It was again opposed as a proscriptive test, and also as an absurdity in one sense, inasmuch as though it declared that the Supreme Court of this country were said to lay down the principle that "all laws contrary to fundamental morality were void," yet in their *practice* for sixty years it would be hard to find any regard even for man's sacred right to himself, and we must take men and courts as they *act*.

Mr. Foster, toward the close, renewed the motion of auxiliaryship to the American Society, and a warm debate followed. Mr. Goodell had previously said "every Abolitionist is auxiliary to every other." Mr. Foster took the ground that the American Society had stood for nearly twenty years as an association for the pro-

mulgation of Anti-Slavery truth, had been faithful and uncompromising, had made its platform broad, yet high, and that if this Society were with it *in spirit*, it should be willing to declare its sympathy to the world. He said: "we ask you to show your colours. If you are with us, we have no controversy; if not, we want to know it frankly. If you do not show your sympathy, if you do not make yourselves auxiliary, we'll crush you, I'll pursue you, &c."

These remarks, and especially the last expression, were much disliked; he was accused of being overbearing, angry &c. I saw nothing but his customary earnest honesty. I quote his remarks that the matter may be fairly stated, and as they were at the time found much fault with, you and your readers can judge with how much reason. I regretted he used the expression, as the same meaning might have been conveyed in words *less objectionable*, but yet, accustomed as all Abolitionists are to plain speaking, knowing, as we do, that if the Truth be spoken, it matters little if it be not always couched in courtly terms, the sensitiveness seemed to show more fear of the *matter* than the *manner*; more distaste for the kernel of Truth within, than nice fastidiousness about the knotty shell and rude husks in which it was embodied. I give the part of Mr. Foster's remarks deemed most objectionable, that "the head and front of his offending" may be fairly known—an aspect, I must say, not specially frightful to me—although a more benignant one would, no doubt, have been better.

Mr. Douglass replied, and spoke of the proscriptive spirit of the American Society; said he was not invited on its platform on account of a change of opinions as to the U. S. Constitution; said they chose an independent existence at present for their Society; might choose, by-and-bye, to be auxiliary; disclaimed any hostile intent toward the American Society, &c. He spoke with great earnestness and feeling.

Mr. Foster replied, saying that Mr. Douglass knew that *all* were invited to the platform. Mr. D. explained that he meant a special invitation. Here Mr. Foster said that peculiar views of the U. S. Constitution could not be a reason for this, as Gerrit Smith had been specially invited. Sally Holley was now an agent of the American Society, both holding views on the constitutional question similar to those now held by Mr. Douglass, &c.

Others took part in the discussion, and at last the vote was taken. Those of us who were opposed to these measures did not choose to vote at all, either way, and thus ended the matter.

If the New York State Anti-Slavery Society does a good work, we shall rejoice; and whenever its members or officers promulgate truth, we shall all stand by them. But it is a matter of regret that at a time when there is need of unity and action, a Constitution was drawn up to which many cannot subscribe, and that a refusal, at the very outset, to become auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society, and the omission of a resolve, which might easily have been introduced, expressing confidence and sympathy for that Society in its great moral warfare, should lessen our faith in the Catholic spirit of the new Society. However, time will reveal more, and we must wait, knowing that Truth will gain the victory.

In the evening addresses, were given to an audience of some 600 persons by Rev. R. R. Raymond, a Baptist clergyman from Syracuse, and Frederick Douglass.

Mr. Raymond made some eloquent and interesting remarks on the rescue of Jerry; said he was a new convert—a child in Anti-Slavery—a remark, the truth of which was well proved by his effort to defend his position as minister in a pro-slavery church, by saying that he should stay to labour with and rebuke his brethren. When Mr. R. merges from his childhood, he will learn that if he be truly faithful and earnest, that church will be too narrow—will proscribe him. However, the tenour of his remarks was good for one newly awakened to Anti-Slavery, yet hardly up to the high tone one might ask for the *first address* given at the *first meeting* of a new Society with a platform so high as theirs was said to be.

Mr. Douglass followed, praising Mr. Raymond highly, speaking eloquently against Colonisation, saying that he thought Kossuth blameworthy, but that Abolitionists, himself included, had been too severe upon him, &c.; and the addresses at the first meeting of the Society closed.

I have thus given, as briefly as possible, the facts by which you can judge of the spirit of this new movement.

Your friend,

G. B. STEBBINS.

## *TO THE FRIENDS OF OUR CAUSE IN CATTARAUGUS COUNTY.*

RANDOLPH, March 25, 1852

You are aware that our long talked of Convention was held in the village of Ashford, on Monday and Tuesday, the 15 and 16 insts., under such circumstances as to not only prevent a general attendance of the people of the County, but as to render the attendance of Delegates from the different Societies impracticable. As you were led to expect, when I was labouring among you, that the Convention would be called at a much earlier date, and that a general notice would be given several weeks in advance, you are, doubtless, wondering why it was appointed just at the breaking up of winter, when the roads are expected to be hardly passable, and why it was noticed but one instead of several weeks in advance. As it is quite natural that such inquiries should arise in your minds, and as it is quite proper that they should be answered, I will proceed to state, briefly, the circumstances that have controlled our action, in reference to the matter.

1. The plan of operation, formed by our New England friends, was so disarranged by the illness of Mr. Foster, and the consequent necessity of Mrs. F.'s leaving the field, to attend upon him, as to render it impossible for those, upon whom we were mainly depending, as speakers, to attend the Convention, until late in the season.

2. Their letter to me, stating when they would be in this County, did not reach me until after their arrival, but for which, the Convention would have been appointed two weeks earlier.

3. Though the first week in March had gone, when they arrived, the weather was cold and the sleighing good, and as appearances indicated, at least, a week's continuance of such weather, it was thought sufficient notice could be got out to ensure a general attendance of Delegates, and the presence of a goodly number of people from different sections of the County.

In this, however, we were doomed to disappointment. The sudden thaw which occurred between the 7th and 15th insts., rendered it scarcely possible for those living at a distance, to be in attendance.

As but two or three of the Societies were represented by Delegates, it was thought best to defer the business pertaining to the formation of a County Society, to be attended to at a County Convention, to be hereafter called for that purpose.

Now, I hope our Anti-Slavery friends in Cattaraugus County, are not in the least disheartened, on account of the Convention having, through a series of disappointments, failed to accomplish its main object, but will stand by and keep up an interest in their town organizations, until they shall be able to meet in Convention, and effect a County organization, through which, a greater work can be done for the slave in one year, than all the Abolitionists in the County will be likely to do in a century, without it.

As to the time of the Convention, I would suggest that it be called at an early day—as soon as we may rely on settled weather and good roads, and before the busy season commences—say the last week in May, on Thursday and Friday, the 27 and 28.

In regard to the place, I should think East Otto would be most suitable, as it is more central to the Anti-Slavery portion of the County and the cause has some friends in that vicinity.

What say our friends, to this? Will not the Secretaries of the different Societies confer with the members, and respond immediately, through the *Standard*? Do it without delay. If you stop where you are, leave things in their present state, the labour and money expended in your County during the year past will be as good as lost: and the real friends of the slave, are too few in number, and too poor in this world's goods, to allow of their wasting any effort.

If you have the spirit and the perseverance, to go on and perfect your organization, and keep it up, and make it answer its aim, your county will, in a short time, rank among those which, in other parts of the country, are striking heavy blows for the bondman. Do you desire the freedom of the slave? You must employ the means to make him free, or your good desire is worthless, or nearly so. To be opposed to Slavery, to stand aloof from any direct support of the system, is but a very small part of the business of a true Abolitionist. The first work of a pro-slavery man is to repent and become an Abolitionist. But the legitimate business of Abolitionists is to employ the means necessary to reform others. Slavery exists, in this country, by virtue of an unenlightened public sentiment and a corrupt public heart. This sentiment must be enlightened, and this heart must be purified, before Slavery can be overthrown. Sweet waters do not flow from a bitter fountain. You cannot gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. Governments and churches are the offspring of the people. It is folly to look for a free government and a Christian church, while the great mass of the people who create and uphold them, are despots and infidels. The *people* must be *reformed*, and the Government and the church will come right of necessity. The masses of the people, in your County, as in others, know nothing of the first principles of Abolition. Indeed, they have not the faintest conception of the principle on which their own rights are founded. This is the great secret of their disregard of the rights of others. When we have preached deliverance to the Captive, on the ground of his inherent and unquestionable right to liberty, with or without the consent of any or all of the Governments on the face of the earth, the people have opened their eyes wide with astonishment. Everywhere, in this County, during the last ten months, have the great majority of those who could be prevailed upon to hear us, been "*astonished at our doctrine.*" The right to liberty, which underlies all other rights, and without which not one other can be secure, instead of being the gift of God to *every* rational creature, a right founded in the eternal nature of things, they have been taught to regard it as an article manufactured by Government, and most graciously conferred upon the favoured portion of its subjects, as though Governments could manufacture rights, and hold them legitimately at their disposal, any more than they can manufacture the immortal intelligences to whom they belong—of whom, indeed, those rights constitute a part! And when shown that a Government, any part of whose aim it is, to enslave any portion of the human family, is the wickedest and most detestable of pirates, is the foulest and bloodiest monster that curses and blackens God's green earth with its scorching and withering blight of lull, and that every intelligent, deliberate supporter of it is as guilty, in the sight of a just God, as if he were the only person concerned, many are pricked in their hearts, and are ready to inquire what they must do to be saved.

Now, to spread the truth that makes men free, and prepares them to labour for the freedom of others, ways and means must be devised.

Having the will to do, the first efficient instrumentality you can employ is a thorough organization. This accomplished, if you are ready to make a hundredth part of the sacrifices you would cheerfully make, if your own children were in Slavery, the work will go bravely on, and it will be but a short time before the wheat, in your County, will be all gathered into the Anti-Slavery garner, and the chaff, if not burned with unquenchable fire, will be driven away before the winds of impartial Freedom.

Now, Friends, let us hear from you without delay. Ashford is awake; Randolph is just arousing from her slumber; Versailles, in the town of Perrysburg—a Society whose members are willing to travel thirty miles on foot, through mud and snow, to attend a Convention—can't be asleep. How is it with Yorkshire, Freedom, Farmersville, Leon, Lyndon, Franklinville, Otto, &c? Yours, for humanity,

J. H. P.

## *CONVENTION AT ASHFORD*

FRIEND GAY: At a convention of the friends of the wronged and outraged, held at the village of Ashford, Cattaraugus Co, March 15 and 16, the following resolutions were discussed and adopted:

1. Resolved, That the enslavement of three millions and upwards of human beings, in this country, in view of its religious and political professions, is the most extraordinary, revolting, horrible spectacle ever presented to the world.

2. Resolved. That Slavery is not a Southern, but a national institution—an institution which exists in our Capital by direct national legislation, and is sustained in every slave State by the strong arm of the Federal Government; consequently, all who support the Government, either by holding offices under it or by appointing others to office, thereby give support and permanency to Slavery, and are involved in all its terrible guilt.

3. Resolved, That after twenty years of earnest but unavailing remonstrance with the churches of this country for their participancy in the crime of Slavery, we are warranted and required, by the principles of the Gospel and the best intests of the cause of Freedom, to apply to them the language of Scripture, "Babylon the Great is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," and to call upon all true men "to come out of her, that they be not partakers of her sins, and that they receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto Heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

4. Resolved, That the Abolition of Slavery is a moral and not a political work, and hence the machinery required for its accomplishment is not a political party, but a moral organization, such as is employed in the prosecution of other moral enterprises.

—The meeting was called to order by J. H. Philleo, when Dr. A. Wilson was appointed President; C. Ward, Secretary; Joseph Parkyn, Secretary. Business Committee—J. Parkyn, Mrs. Rebecca Parkyn, Calvin Woodruff, Mrs. Foster, Mrs. Philleo. Financial Committee—Calvin Woodruff, Mrs. Beach.

Mr. FOSTER then proceeded with eloquent and truthful remarks, in which he declared that this country is the most guilty of any other people in the world, except those engaged with them, in other parts, in the same business; this country is full of slaveholders; your churches, your pulpits, your communion tables; they rob your cradles, &c. As an evidence of the Anti-Slavery of this county, see the number present at this meeting (it is due to the people to say that the notice was very short, and the going very bad). He referred to the excitement occasioned by Haynau whipping one woman, and contrasted it with the action of American Haynaus, who whip women. He referred then to Kossuth and the demonstration at his reception. Frederick Douglass is a greater man than Kossuth, yet how does this nation treat him. I know of no way to cure this state of things but to show you your sins. If Anti-Slavery men and women are united, we shall succeed; but as it is, Anti-Slavery men and women mix up in Church and at elections. I call on you to come out from them, that ye be not partakers of her plagues. Some say, can you not soften your words? Yes, we can; but there is no use in coming amongst you with cordials; you want the amputating knife. As an example, see Jesus Christ. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers; woe unto you scribes, pharisees." Read him throughout. If possible, stronger language is now needed. Ye not only devour widows' houses, and, for a show, make long prayers, but rob by taking the child from the mother and selling it into perpetual bondage. Only think of three millions forbidden to read God's holy word, and all this by the consent of the American Church; such churches are full of wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores. Ministers on Zion's walls cry peace when there is no peace. We are here to try to counteract, aye, to cure, this evil. If you see a man giving poison to his child, and you refuse to interfere, its blood will be required at your hands; you who are attached to your political parties are guilty, and the blood of the slave is in your skirts. We want new words to arouse you to a sense of your guilt, as common language fails to convey an adequate idea of the enormity of your guilt.

Mrs. FOSTER then said, all in this neighbourhood profess to be Abolitionists, but their absence shows that they are not such; any person can vote up or vote down their sentiments. Some say we are Webster Abolitionists; others, Cass or Dickinson Abolitionists; some call us Infidels, followers of Fanny Wright. Remember, if they called the master of the house Belzebub, they will call us Infidel. Jesus' life was a holy, spotless life; they could find no fault, yet said he casteth out devils by the prince of devils. We have come here to give the institution of marriage to three millions of persons; the law says they shall live in adultery. We have come to show who breaks up the institution of marriage. That man who has said that we are followers of Fanny Wright, and Infidels, breaks up the institution of marriage, and is of that character; and I will prove it to you, if you will point me out the person or give me his name. If there are shepherds in this place who stand on Zion's walls, if we are wolves in sheep's clothing, why are they not here to take off the sheep skin, and expose the wolf (only one of them, the Secretary, was present). You can carry the Bible to any other country with greater safety to your lives than to carry it to the slaves of the South.

JOSEPH PARKYN said, in reference to the third resolution, the time has been when he did not see these facts as he sees them now, and he considers the Church highly criminal in consequence of her connection with Slavery, by owning, holding and voting for the perpetuity of Slavery; thus she may be called Babylon, who traded in the souls of men.

Mrs. FOSTER, in speaking on the 2nd Resolution, brought up a supposed case of a banditti, back of the Rocky Mountains, gentleman-like in their dress and appearance; the State of New York unites with them for the protection of their person and property. Do they not agree to be partakers of their stolen treasures, and combine against their common foe, and by so doing make them all eligible for all the offices of Government, and even President of the United States? This is analogous to our National Government.

J. H. PHILLEO remarked, it is every man's right to be free; yet every man under this Government, when put into office, swears in the name of God to rob his fellow-men of all their God-given rights. If they will persist in this business, I would advise that they stop swearing men in God's name, or swear them in the name of the devil. We must tear off the mask. If men with the garb of D. D. will shed a few crocodile tears, they can do it more successfully.

EVENING SESSION.

The 2nd Resolution was discussed.

Mr. BUNN declared Slavery to be a Southern, and not a National Institution, as it does not exist by law, neither makes nor destroys it, and has nothing to do with it. The Constitution of the United States is an Anti-Slavery instrument. We may prove by Algebra that two and two make five, but we cannot believe it, but shall still have our own opinion. So you may by argument prove Slavery to be upheld by the General Government; but we cannot believe it, and shall still have our own opinion or consciousness that this is not the case, although we cannot explain it. If it is a National Government matter, how is it manifest? Is it like the nationality of Banks, or the Post Office Department, which are created and regulated by Government, and carried on by its officers?

Mr. FOSTER replied: marriage is a Divine institution. An individual tries a case in the Supreme Court, and it is considered lawful; so the Fugitive Slave Law recognises the legality of Slavery. There are, in all this Government, only about 180,000 slaveholders. These rob three millions and a quarter of all they have. In New York no coloured man is a member of this Government. If he owns $250 in land, or a house, or other property, he can vote; but who votes in such a case, the man or his property? Women and coloured persons and minors are not members of this Government. Slave-owners steal all the horses, sheep, cattle, and everything the slave has, and rob him of himself, and the North agrees to the robbery. Lafayette came here not to aid our country to free her slaves, but to defend it against an unjust tax. You are sworn to defend the State or body of men who make the laws, and help to execute them. You have deposited your vote for a man who is sworn to support the Constitution, one of the clauses binding you to protect the United States against invasion and domestic violence. You are bound to go at their call; will you go?

Mr. BUNN said he would go if called on to put down Insurrection and Domestic violence. Are you not therefore a slaveholder? He mentioned the case of Nat. Turner, whom he considered one of the noblest men of our country, but how was that man treated? He was found in rebellion against the government.

Mrs. FOSTER said, when she was in the house of Joshua R. Giddings, she said to him: if your wife and children were in Slavery, would you go and sit down by their side, and agree to such laws as they might be disposed to make, to keep them in perpetual bondage? He said, it is a hard question to answer. I told him he would put a bullet through them rather; she said, men are known by the company with whom they associate. Not like Jesus, who was the friend of publicans and sinners, and ate and drank with them; he did not join in any iniquitous action, but such sit down with these freebooters in full Communion.

J. H. PHILLEO said, those who take the Liberty Party view of the Constitution, say that it is an Anti-Slavery instrument; to such I say, the Supreme Court interprets the Constitution. Whatever that instrument may be in the hands of honest men, as it is interpreted and enforced by the general government, it is made a slaveholding instrument. If it is wrong to hold slaves, it is no matter what the Constitution says, wrong is wrong, and the man who does it is a robber. So is every one who calls on us to do it. I have no objection to Gerrit Smith's view of the Constitution in a legal sense.

Mr. BUNN remarked, incidental support of Slavery is by them proven; then I deny that Slavery is a National Institution. I suppose that each individual in this government, is not either to vote or receive office. Now a ship may spring aleak and not be entirely unseaworthy. For instance, shall we not use the Elective Franchise, in the Temperance cause, because intemperance is legalized.

Mr. FOSTER said, if you make me believe that two and three make four, I will hold it as true; although I now believe that two and two make four. The gentleman has introduced a proposition not found in the resolution; it is a position not believed in this country by the masses; the first is that it is not a Southern, but a National institution, it exists by direct national legislation. In supporting it, we become involved in its guilt. I will try to prove it. The Banking institution is a State institution; there are counties or large sections without any Bank. If Virginia owes a debt and the United States becomes responsible for her debt; then it is not the State of Virginia which was previously in debt, and contracted that debt, independent of the United States? Again, Slavery exists in the United States Capital, and in other Districts of the United States, for whom the United States legislate; therefore, no other law can abolish it. It exists in the Territories by United States law and no other. It is carried on between one State and another. It is sustained in each of the States, not only by the South, but by the North, and principally the latter. You see a man in yonder place laid on his back, and you see him hand out his pocket book to a mere boy; then his watch, then his rings; would you not say to him, why don't you kick that miserable robber over. But look! yonder is a man with a pistol or revolver, and others in another direction, armed in the same manner. Now who are they that make him lie there to be plundered! This is the action of the North. This government sells every seventh mother for purposes of prostitution, and into perpetual Slavery; every seventh father is robbed of his wife and children. Three and a quarter millions of slaves; there will be no difference of opinion as to who keeps the prisoner in Auburn prison; you know the inhabitants keep them there. There are only about 180,000 slave owners; so there are about thirty slaves to one master. Could I hold thirty of you? I could not hold one of you when I am asleep. One man cannot build a railroad; it requires some to manufacture iron; so every slave claimant, is not a slaveholder, "as some have no power." Suppose I furnish a saddle and bridle to a man, knowing that he designs to steal a horse, or I even tell him where he can find a saddle and bridle for that purpose, am I not guilty of the same crime? Most surely. So it is with any combination of men who aid to hold or return the slave! Southern States are bound together. Northern States are also bound. Before the Federal compact, it was a State Institution, but it was then made a National institution, and was then made a hunting ground to hunt men, women, and children, by human Bloodhounds! When the great Magyar, General Kossuth, comes here, he is free, and so are the Irish, and all other nations, except a certain portion of our own citizens, viz.: "One for every six." Canada is no partner to this horrid robbery, but New York is. Is the Fugitive Slave Act a State law? Not at all. It is an Act of the United States; every citizen is a life guard for Slavery, or slave claimants. The government is the organized force of the State; the majority are ruled by the minority. The United States army is kept up at an expense of $10,000,000 annually, for the purpose of keeping slaves in their chains. We have the same reason for a standing army that Louis Napoleon has. When Nat. Turner rose and struck for Liberty, but for the army he and his companions would have been free. His name will go down to posterity, as a greater than Washington. He was a Christian. Southerners do not want a dissolution of the Union; see how they acted when John Q. Adams introduced a petition for it; a member from South Carolina wanted him expelled, yet South Carolina has been loud and long in the cry for dissolution. No man understood every part of our Government better than John Q. Adams. Mr. Underwood, of Kentucky, once said, "to dissolve the Union, is the dissolution of Slavery; if the Union were dissolved they would cross the line and curse their masters from the other shore. A million of slaves stand ready to strike for freedom, at the first tap of the drum." If this Government hold the slaves and you support the Government, you hold the slaves. If ten persons commit murder, one of them is not the tenth part of a murderer, but all ten are murderers, as Christ said, all the blood shed from righteous Abel unto Barachias, will I require at this generation. So I say of this Government, and you are guilty; why not act consistent. Honour among thieves. Therefore be not a dastard; will you help carry on this business, will you go and put down the slave if he strike for freedom, then why say so. If you do go what will you do; remember every seventh mother is sold for prostitution.

Mrs. FOSTER, he is a mean man who will do it; there is a time coming when you will need a friend. You will confront upwards of three millions at the judgment seat of Christ. This government manufactures four hundred slaves every day. The man who holds a slave is the meanest creature on earth; no decent man who understands the matter, will vote under the Constitution, if it upholds Slavery.

Mr BUNN, we did not mean to evade the fact that Slavery exists in the District of Columbia. A nations' institution is regulated by the national government; we can abolish Slavery and have done it. Slavery is sustained in districts otherwise than by direct legislation. Congress never created it in the Territories. Slavery has ever been perpetuated by brute force. The Fugitive Slave Bill gives the owner right to ransack the country to recover the fugitive; this does not reduce him to Slavery, does not hold him as a slave, this is only an incidental aid; it is said to be a necessary clause. Whatever the States do in the premises, the Nation is not responsible for it.

*Tuesday Morning*—met pursuant to adjournment. The Vice President, C. Ward, in the Chair; the Secretary having been called away, Charles T. Beach was chosen Secretary pro tem.

The Resolutions being read, the discussion of the second resolution was resumed by S. S. Foster, and J. H. Philleo, in its support (no report of which was prepared).

AFTERNOON SESSION.

A scene of confusion was witnessed, occasioned by the opposition of those who were not identified with the Convention, who appeared to manifest a disposition to prolong the discussion on the second resolution, and it appearing to the members of the convention a design to prevent a discussion of the other resolutions, a formal vote was taken, by which it was determined to drop further discussion: when the resolution was passed, as was the first also. The fourth resolution was then accepted and discussed, Mr. and Mrs. Foster speaking in its support, when Mrs. Foster gave way for the financial Committee, to secure funds and pledges for the convention.

EVENING SESSION.

Mrs. PHILLEO, addressed the meeting. In her address she said, I wish to make a few remarks concerning severe terms. Terms cannot be too severe for some persons. See how Jesus Christ addressed them, 'Scribes, pharisees, hypocrites, liars.' If he were here to night, in the person of Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, many would not bear his language; many persons ask, why we come out against Ministers, and say that they do not say or do any thing to occasion it? even our women are as silent as the grave, while fifteen hundred thousand of our own sex are in Slavery, and sold for wholesale prostitution; our hearts need converting more than our heads; we want to feel for human woes, and act for universal Liberty; we want to take it home. Mothers, take it home to yourselves; hear those groans from your sister mothers, saying give me back my babes; can we feel indifferent in this matter; some here are not mothers, but you know how to love a mother. What indignation I used to feel when I looked at these things; I have often seen young women turn and laugh or whisper to a young man at her side, when these tales of woe are told; how can you consent to vote your sex into perpetual chains. If women will thus persist, we ought to speak out, for women do more to hold the slave in chains than any other class of persons. If I were a young lady, I would not lend my arm to any young man who would vote in favour of slaveholders, or uphold such a revolting system; woman does more to keep mankind in Slavery than man; she is the corner stone of our country's Institutions. If the majority of the women of this village were Abolitionists, a majority of the men would be so. Allow a man to protect you who cares not for the enslavement of his fellow men! shame on such persons; I have no sympathy for that woman who is silent on the subject of Slavery; her guilt of omission is the greatest sin; I repeat it, men are what women make them. After a few other remarks and some business, the convention adjourned.

THE CAPTURER OF LOPEZ REWARDED.—The man, named Castenado, who captured Lopez, has returned to Havana laden with honours. The Queen gave him $6,000, and made him a captain in the rural militia, with a salary of $110 a month; ten negroes and a tract of land have been given him. The order of Isabel decorates his person; his children are to be educated at the expense of the government, and while in Spain, he was permitted the farce of kissing the hands of the Queen and the little princess. He can neither read nor write.—*Florida Journal.*

——MORTALITY AMONG GENERALS.—Within the last few years which have elapsed since the commencement of the war with Mexico, no less than thirteen Generals have departed this life, viz.—Generals Taylor, Worth, Mason, Brady, Kearney, Hamer, Hopping, Belknap, Duncan, Croghan, Brooks, Arbuckle, and Whiting.

——Dr. HUNT, of New Orleans, it will be recollected by our readers, killed, sometime last year, in a duel, John Frost, the editor of the *N. O. Crescent*. Dr. Hunt afterwards surrendered himself to the authorities, and was held to bail. The result of the matter is given below, as stated in the New Orleans papers:

"Judge Larue excused himself, and would not sit in the case. Judge Strawbridge declared that he was too unwell to attend, and Judge Buchanan stated that he had no time. Under these circumstances, the District Attorney said that he believed that he had done his duty in the matter, but he could not try the case without a Judge. He would therefore move to dismiss the accused. Judge Larue then ordered the case to be dismissed.

## Receipts for the Standard.

*From March 1st to April 1st, 1852.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 651 | Peter Brown, Liverpool, England | $2 00 |
| 630 | P. Pixley, Unionville, O. | 2 00 |
| 665 | Lathrop Francis, Leon Centre, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 665 | B. Southwick " " | 2 00 |
| 614 | O. Mudge, New London, Ct. | 4 00 |
| 639 | Geo. Lukeu, Penn Yan, N. Y. | 1 00 |
| 639 | Horace B. Bruin " " | 1 00 |
| 639 | Lyman Munger " " | 1 00 |
| 639 | Morris Earle " " | 1 00 |
| 624 | Geo. W. Reynolds, Franklin, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 645 | F. Hover, Richmond, Ind. | 1 00 |
| 660 | Alcinda Smith " " | 1 00 |
| 666 | Miss Sarah Bruce, Hanover, N. H. | 2 00 |
| 654 | John Luptor, Leeds, Eng. | 4 00 |
| 635 | F. Purdy, Magadore, O. | 2 00 |
| 662 | A. D. Wright, Deer River, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 667 | C. V. Bush, Penn Yan " | 2 00 |
| 641 | A. Shewman, Salubria " | 1 00 |
| 572 | Freeman Morton, Plymouth, Mass. | 2 00 |
| 667 | Mrs. Gwynn, Boston " | 2 00 |
| 659 | E. Ann Peet, Farmersville, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 664 | E. Buckingham, Trenton " | 2 00 |
| 667 | N. Whipple, Mystic, Conn. | 2 00 |
| 667 | J. W. Brown, Greenmanville, Ct. | 2 00 |
| 667 | Wm. H. Banks, Millport, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 667 | M. Falls " " | 2 00 |
| 664 | Sidney Smith, Borodino, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 667 | J. H. Rogers, Elmira " | 2 00 |
| 641 | S. B. Haskell " " | 1 00 |
| 667 | Wm. Cleveland " " | 2 00 |
| 667 | E. S. Coleman, Ellicottville, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 667 | J. L. Coleman " " | 2 00 |
| 667 | N. Larabee " " | 2 00 |
| 667 | J. A. Whitney, Rushford " | 2 00 |
| 655 | A. G. Hussey, Nantucket, Mass. | 2 00 |
| 624 | A. Johnson, Weare, N. H. | 1 00 |
| 642 | Cyrus Barlow, Horseheads, N. Y. | 1 00 |
| 642 | M. Stoddard " " | 1 00 |
| 642 | J. A. Crystie " " | 1 00 |
| 642 | Peter Quick, Havannah " | 1 00 |
| 668 | M. Tompkins, Salubria " | 2 00 |
| 642 | M. B. Guinniss " " | 1 00 |
| 592 | L. Downing, Mexico " | 3 00 |
| 618 | Isaac S. Wilde, Quaker Springs, N. Y. | 2 00 |
| 676 | Sarah Harris, Fall River, Mass. | 4 00 |
| 678 | John Humphrey, West Norfolk, Ct. | 5 00 |
| 676 | Daniel F. Child, Boston, Mass. | 2 00 |
| 669 | Herbert Gleason, Bath, Me. | 2 00 |
| —— | Mrs. S. B. Shaw, for 3 subscribers | 20 00 |
| 614 | A. W. Weston, Weymouth, Mass. | 2 00 |
| 625 | Daniel Parker, New Richmond, O. | 4 00 |
| | | $118 00 |

DONATIONS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Wm. R. Foster, Canandagua, N. Y. | 5 00 |

*Collections for the American A. S. Society, by S. S. and A. K. Foster.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Contribution, Lavanna | $1 62 |
| | Hanford Smith, Lake Ridge | 1 00 |
| | Isaac Davis " | 1 00 |
| | Collection " | 2 74 |
| | Collection, Groton | 7 59 |
| | Norman Bailey, Lock | 1 00 |
| | Collection " | 4 81 |
| | Collection over expenses, Elmira | 13 18 |
| | Collection over expenses, Milliport | 6 90 |
| | Collection over expenses, Jefferson | 8 47 |
| | Collection over expenses, Havana | 7 94 |
| | Horace R. Bruin, Penn Yan | 1 00 |
| | J. W. Hartshorn " " | 5 00 |
| | Collection over expenses " | 9 62 |
| | " " Farmersville | 2 00 |
| | " " Ellicottville | 1 85 |
| | Hugh Orr, East Otto | 1 00 |
| | Chas. T. Beach " | 1 00 |
| | Collection " | 4 95 |
| | Isaac Post, Rochester | 1 00 |
| | Jediah Pound, Pultneyville | 1 00 |
| | Anna S. Pound " | 25 |
| | J. S. Pound " | 25 |
| | Harvey Pound " | 28 |
| | Edith L. Pound " | 25 |
| | Collection " | 1 97 |
| | Anna Wicks, Palmyra | 5 00 |
| | Rufus Sweasey " | 25 |
| | Pliny Sexton " | 3 00 |
| | Wm. B. Cogswell, Marion | 1 00 |
| | T. M. Clark " | 50 |
| | James Kingsworth " | 25 |
| | M. Adams " | 1 00 |
| | Jeremiah Clark " | 1 00 |
| | R. A. Green " | 50 |
| | Jedediah Clark " | 50 |
| | William Lovejoy " | 50 |
| | James L. Delong " | 25 |
| | Martin Hester " | 25 |
| | Jeremiah Clark " | 25 |
| | James Kingsworth " | 12 |
| | J. R. Russell " | 50 |
| | James Sweasy " | 1 00 |
| | O. B. Henyon " | 25 |
| | A. Stanton " | 50 |
| | E. M. Galloway " | 1 00 |
| | John Bush " | 25 |
| | Elias Durfee " | 1 00 |
| | Ezekiel Clark " | 1 00 |
| | Susan Strouds " | 25 |
| | Dwight Smith " | 50 |
| | Lucy Simmons " | 12 |
| | Sarah D. Clark " | 2 00 |
| | Lawson Adams " | 25 |
| | E. H. Durfee " | 25 |
| | S. Cogswell " | 25 |
| | W. D. Davis " | 25 |
| | Benjamin Atwater " | 25 |
| | Cash " | 10 |
| | Robert Cogshall " | 25 |
| | Gerome Ducll " | 25 |
| | James Caldwell " | 50 |
| | Edwin White " | 50 |
| | Lucy M. Simmons, Walworth | 50 |
| | Edmund Lawrence " | 50 |
| | Phillip Lawrence " | 50 |
| | Maria Lawrence " | 2 00 |
| | John Lawrence " | 3 00 |
| | Mrs. Teatler " | 25 |
| | A. F. Simmons " | 50 |
| | H. S. Simmons " | 1 00 |
| | L. I. Hicks " | 50 |
| | Ann Richmond " | 50 |
| | R. R. Richmond " | 5 00 |
| | H. G. Mason " | 1 00 |
| | Elial Yeomans " | 1 00 |
| | A friend " | 12 |
| | Sarah Mungan " | 25 |
| | Hiram Park " | 50 |
| | T. C. Brown " | 25 |
| | S. H. Merritt, West Walworth | 1 00 |
| | Elias Hicks " | 50 |
| | Timothy Howland " | 1 00 |
| | Peter Carman " | 50 |
| | W. C. Howland " | 1 00 |
| | James A. Parker " | 50 |
| | Hicks Halstead " | 1 00 |
| | Thomas S. Wilbur " | 25 |
| | Thomas Taylor " | 15 |
| | G. E. Underhill " | 50 |
| | Samuel Sweet " | 50 |
| | Henry H. Howland " | 1 00 |
| | Charles Clark " | 22 |
| | Asa Peck " | 25 |
| | Caroline Halstead " | 50 |
| | Joseph Gould " | 1 00 |
| | Josiah Rice, Lodus | 50 |
| | Isaac Brockway, Jackson, Ind. | 1 00 |
| | Lavina Fox, Ashford | 50 |
| | Collection " | 3 07 |
| | Rebec. Parkyn " | 25 |
| | Cal. Woodruff " | 50 |
| | G. Hugaboom, Versailles | 50 |
| | Joseph Parkyn, Ashford | 25 |
| | Hiram Rockwell " | 25 |
| | Peter Allen, Williamson | 25 |
| | Griffith Cooper " | 3 00 |
| | Jas. Gregg " | 25 |
| | Mary Adams " | 50 |
| | N. J. Allen " | 50 |
| | Susan B. Underwood " | 50 |
| | Car. G. Underwood " | 50 |
| | S. Underwood " | 25 |
| | Mary Ann Cogswell " | 50 |
| | Lydia P. Cogswell " | 50 |
| | Mary Anthoy " | 50 |
| | W. Thomas " | 1 00 |
| | Hannah Maynard " | 1 00 |
| | Hiram Harden " | 1 00 |
| | D. F. Luce " | 1 00 |
| | Silas Anthony " | 1 00 |
| | Thomas Seely " | 50 |
| | Eger Brown " | 50 |
| | C. B. Wade " | 1 00 |
| | Charles Barker, " | 25 |
| | E. M. Gardiner " | 50 |
| | C. M. Adams " | 50 |
| | E. F. White " | 50 |
| | E. R. Woodhull " | 25 |
| | Benj. E. Weter " | 20 |
| | Fortis Benjamin, " | 25 |
| | Marvin A. Eddy, " | 50 |
| | Alman Cogswell, " | 1 00 |
| | Luther Dean, Webster, | 50 |
| | | 162 52 |

*Collections for the American A. S. Society by S. Holley.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Donation by J. Burr, Ludlowville | 3 00 |
| | Collection " | 5 28 |
| | Collection over expenses at Ithaca | 5 28 |
| | " at Penn Yan | 17 57 |
| | " at Jefferson | 9 07 |
| | " at Havanna | 9 21 |
| | " at Millport | 8 37 |
| | " at Southport | 1 50 |
| | " at Elmira | 4 28 |
| | " at Horseheads | 6 60 |
| | | 70 16 |

RECAPITULATION.

| | |
|---|---|
| Receipts for the 'Standard' | $118 00 |
| Donations | 5 00 |
| Collections | 232 68 |
| Total | $355 68 |

## Notices.

### Anti-Slavery Convention in Cincinnati, Ohio.

FRIENDS OF FREEDOM—We invite you to meet in Convention in Cincinnati, on TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, and THURSDAY, April, 27th, 28th, and 29th, 1852, commencing at 9 1-2 o'clock A. M., of the first named day.

We call upon you without distiction of party, to come together in the spirit of fraternal love, to inquire what more can be done for the three millions of slaves in these United States, and to take such advance measures as a pure Christianity, a true patriotism, and an exalted charity, require of sound hearted philanthropists.

How many of you will be ready to respond to this call? How many of you will turn aside for a few days from your ordinary avocations to give attention to the cries of humanity? How many of you will by some of the funds you ordinarily spend beyond your necessities, try to save enough to take you to the Convention, or to send a representative from your neighbourhood? Come, Friends, prove your faith by your works, and let the poor, crushed slaves have some comfort of hope in hearing of a great and enthusistic Convention of devoted men and women from all parts of our extensive country, weeping over their wrongs, and pouring out words of fire in advocacy of their rights.

We offer you our hospitalities, and shall be happy to entertain our guests in a way to make their visit agreeable to them. Come, and let us lay our gifts upon the altar of an exalted and exalting faith, and renew our Christian vow, that whilst there is a slave to be liberated, there shall not be wanting an Abolitionist to strike the fetters from his limbs.

Yours for the right and the humane, for justice and for love.

Mrs. Sarah H. Ernst,
" Elizabeth Coleman,
" Julia Harwood,
" A. Mann,
" Mary M. Guild,
} *Committee of Ladies.*

Miss. Kesiah Emory,
Edward Harwood,
John H. Coleman,
John Jolliffe,
Christian Donaldson,
Wm. Henry Brisbane,
Levi Coffin,
} *Committee of Gent'n.*

Cincinnati, O., January 5th, 1852.

## Advertisements.

## Miscellany.

### MEMORY AT CRANFORD.

I HAVE often noticed that almost every one has his own individual small economies—careful habits of saving fractions of pennies in some one peculiar direction—any disturbance of which annoys him more than spending shillings or pounds in some real extravagance. An old gentleman of my acquaintance, who took the intelligence of the failure of a Joint-Stock Bank, in which some of his money was invested, with stoical mildness, worried his family all through a long summer's day, because one of them had torn (instead of cutting) out the written leaves of his now useless bank-book; of course, the corresponding pages at the other end came out as well: and this little unnecessary waste of paper (his private economy) chafed him more than all the loss of his money. Envelopes fretted his soul terribly when they first came in; the only way in which he could reconcile himself to such waste of his cherished article was by patiently turning inside out all that were sent to him, and so making them serve again.

Even now, though tamed by age, I see him casting wistful glances at his daughters when they send a whole instead of a half sheet of note-paper, with the three lines of acceptance to an invitation, written on only one of the sides. I am not above owning that I have this human weakness myself. String is my foible. My pockets get full of little hanks of it, picked up and twisted together, ready for uses that never come. I am seriously annoyed if any one cuts the string of a parcel, instead of patiently and faithfully undoing it fold by fold. How people can bring themselves to use Indian-rubber rings, which are a sort of deification of string, as lightly as they do, I cannot imagine. To me an Indian rubber ring is a precious treasure. I have one which is not new, one that I picked up off the floor, nearly six years ago. I have really tried to use it; but my heart failed me, and I could not commit the extravagance.

Small pieces of butter grieve others. They cannot attend to conversation, because of the annoyance occasioned by the habit which some people have of invariably taking more butter than they want. Have you not seen the anxious look (almost mesmeric) which such persons fix on the article? They would feel it a relief if they might bury it out of their sight by popping it into their own mouths and swallowing it down, and they are really made happy if the person on whose plate it lies unused, suddenly breaks off a piece of toast (which he does not want at all) and eats up his butter. They think that this is not waste.

Now Miss Matey Jenkyns was chary of candles. We had many devices to use as few as possible. In winter afternoons she would sit knitting for two or three hours, she could do this in the dark, or by fire-light; and, when I asked if I might not ring for candles to finish stitching my wristbands, she told me to "keep blind-man's holiday." They were usually brought in with tea, but we only burnt one at a time. As we lived in constant preparation for a friend who might come in, any evening (but who never did), it required some contrivance to keep our two candles of the same length, ready to be lighted, and to look as if we burnt two always. The candles took it in turns; and, whatever we might be talking about or doing, Miss Matey's eyes were habitually fixed upon the candle, ready to jump up and extinguish it, and to light the other before they had become too uneven in length to be restored to equality in the course of the evening.

One night I remember that this candle economy particularly annoyed me. I had been very much tired of my compulsory "blind-man's holiday," especially as Miss Matey had fallen asleep, and I did not like to stir the fire, and run the risk of awakening her: so I could not even sit on the rug and scorch myself with sewing by firelight, according to my usual custom. I fancied Miss Matey must be dreaming of her early life; for she spoke one or two words in her uneasy sleep, bearing reference to persons who were dead long before. When Martha brought in the lighted candle and tea, Miss Matey started into wakefulness, with a strange bewildered look around, as if we were not the people she expected to see about her. There was a little sad expression that shadowed her face as she recognised me; but immediately afterwards she tried to give me her usual smile. All through tea-time, her talk ran upon the days of her childhood and youth. Perhaps this reminded her of the desirableness of looking over all the old family letters, and destroying such as ought not to be allowed to fall into the hands of strangers; for she had often spoken of the necessity of this task, but had always shrunk from it with a timid dread of something painful. To-night, however, she rose up after tea, and went for them—in the dark; for she piqued herself on the precise neatness of all her chamber arrangements, and used to look uneasily at me when I lighted a bed candle to go to another room for anything. When she returned, there was a faint, pleasant smell of Tonquin beans in the room. I had always noticed this scent about any of the things which had belonged to her mother, and many of the letters were addressed to her—yellow bundles of love-letters, sixty or seventy years old.

Miss Matey undid the packet with a sigh; but she stilled it directly, as if it were hardly right to regret the light of time, or of life either. We agreed to look them over separately, each taking a different letter out of the same bundle, and describing its contents to the other, before destroying it. I never knew what sad work the reading of old letters was before that evening, though I could hardly tell why. The letters were as happy as letters could be—at least those early letters were. There was in them a vivid and intense sense of the present time, which seemed so strong and full as if it could never pass away, and as if the warm, living hearts that so expressed themselves could never die, and be as nothing to the sunny earth. I should have felt less melancholy, I believe, if the letters had been more so. I saw the tears quietly stealing down the well-worn furrows of Miss Matey's cheeks, and her spectacles often wanted wiping. I trusted at last that she would light the other candle, for my own eyes were rather dim, and I wanted more light to see the pale, faded ink; but no—even though her tears, she saw and remembered her little economical ways.

The earliest set of letters were two bundles tied together, and ticketed (in Miss Jenkyns' handwriting), "Letters interchanged between my ever-honoured father, and my dearly beloved mother, prior to their marriage, in July, 1764." I should guess that the Rector of Cranford was about twenty-seven years of age when he wrote those letters: and Miss Matey told me that her mother was just eighteen at the time of her wedding. With my idea of the Rector derived from a picture in the dining parlour, stiff and stately in a huge full-bottomed wig, with gown, cassock, and bands, and his hand upon a copy of the only sermon he ever published—it was strange to read these letters. They were full of eager, passionate ardour; short homely sentences, right fresh from the heart: very different from the grand Latinised Johnsonian style of the printed sermon, preached before some Judge at Assize time. His letters were a curious contrast to those of his girl-bride. She was evidently rather annoyed at his demands upon her for expressions of love, and could not quite understand what he meant by repeating the same thing over in so many different ways: but what she was quite clear about was her longing for a white "Paduasay"—whatever that might be: and six or seven letters were principally occupied in asking her lover to use his influence with her parents (who evidently kept her in good order) to obtain this or that article of dress, more especially the white "Paduasay." He cared nothing how she was dressed: she was always lovely enough for him as he took pains to assure her, when she begged him to express in his answers a predilection for particular pieces of finery, in order that she might show what he said to her parents.

But at length he seemed to find out that she would not be married till she had a "trousseau" to her mind: and then he sent her a letter, which had evidently accompanied a whole box full of finery, and in which he requested that he might be dressed in everything her heart desired. This was the first letter, ticketed in a frail, delicate hand, "From my dearest John." Shortly afterwards they were married—I suppose, from the intermission in their correspondence.

"We must burn them, I think," said Miss Matey, looking doubtfully at me. "No one will care for them when I am gone." And one by one she dropped them into the middle of the fire; watching each blaze up, die out, and rise away, in faint, white, ghostly semblance, up the chimney, before she gave up another to the same fate. The room was light enough now: but I, like her, was fascinated into watching the destruction of those letters, into which the honest warmth of a manly heart had been poured forth.

The next letter, likewise docketed by Miss Jenkyns, was endorsed, "Letter of pious congratulation and exhortation from my venerable grandfather to my mother, on occasion of my own birth. Also some practical remarks on the desirability of keeping warm the extremities of infants, from my excellent grandmother."

The first part was indeed a severe and forcible picture of the responsibilities of mothers, and a warning against the evils that were in the world and lying in ghastly wait for the little baby of two days old. His wife did not write, said the old gentleman, because he had forbidden it, she being indisposed with a sprained ankle which (he said) quite incapacitated her from holding a pen. However, at the foot of the page was a small "r. o.," and on turning it over, sure enough there was a letter to "my dear, dearest Molly," begging her, when she left her room, whatever she did, to go *up* stairs before going *down*; and telling her to wrap her baby's feet up in flannel, and keep it warm by the fire, although it was summer, for babies were so tender.

It was pretty to see from the letters, which were evidently exchanged with some frequency between the young mother and the grandmother, how the girlish vanity was being weeded out of her heart by love for her baby. The white "Paduasay" figured again in the letters, with almost as much vigour as before. In one, it was being made into a christening cloak for the baby. It decked it when it went with its parents to spend a day or two at Arley Hall. It added to its charms when it was "the prettiest little baby that ever was seen. Dear mother, I wish you could see her! Without any parshality, I do think she will grow up a regular bewty!" I thought of Miss Jenkyns, grey, withered, and wrinkled; and I wondered if her mother had known her in the courts of heaven; and then I knew that she had, and that they stood there in angelic guise.

There was a great gap before any of the rector's letters appeared. And then his wife had changed her mode of endorsement. It was no longer from "My dearest John;" it was from "My honoured Husband." The letters were written on occasion of the publication of the same sermon which was represented in the picture. The preaching before "My Lord Judge," and the "publishing by request," was evidently the culminating point—the event of his life. It had been necessary for him to go up to London to superintend it through the press. Many friends had to be called upon, and consulted, before he could decide on any printer fit for so onerous a task; and at length it was arranged that J. and J. Rivingtons were to have the honourable responsibility. The worthy rector seemed to be strung up by the occasion to a high literary pitch, for he could hardly write a letter to his wife without cropping out into Latin. I remember the end of one of his letters ran thus: "I shall ever hold the virtuous qualities of my Molly in remembrance, *dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus regit artus*," which, considering that the English of his correspondent was sometimes at fault in grammar, and often in spelling, might be taken as a proof of how much he "idealized" his Molly; and, as Miss Jenkyns used to say, "People talk a great deal about idealizing nowadays, whatever that may mean." But this was nothing to a fit of writing classical poetry, which soon seized him; in which his Molly figured away as Maria;" the letter containing the *carmen* was endorsed by her, "Hebrew verses sent me by my honoured husband. I thowt to have had a letter about killing the pig, but must wait. Mem, to send the poetry to Sir Peter Arley, as my husband desires."

And in a post-scriptum note in his hand-writing, it was stated that the Ode had appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, December, 1772. Her letters back to her husband (treasured as fondly by him as if they had been M. T. Ciceronis Epistolæ), were more satisfactory to an absent husband and father, than his could ever have been to her. She told him how Deborah sewed her seam very neatly every day, and read to her in the books he had sent her; how she was a very "forrard," good child, but *would* ask questions her mother could not answer; but how she did not let herself down by saying she did not know, but took to stirring the fire, or sending the "forrard" child on an errand. Matey was now the mother's darling, and promised (like her sister at her age) to be a great beauty. I was reading aloud to Miss Matey, who smiled and sighed a little at the hope, so fondly expressed, that "little Matey might not be vain, even if she were a beauty."

"I had very pretty hair, my dear," said Miss Matilda, "and not a bad mouth." And I saw her soon afterwards adjust her cap and draw herself up.

But to return to Mrs. Jenkyns's letters. She told her husband about the poor in the parish; what homely domestic medicines she had administered; what kitchen physic she had sent. She had evidently held his displeasure as a rod in pickle over the heads of all the ne'er-do-wells. She asked for his directions about the cows and pigs; and did not always obtain them, as I have shown before.

The kind old grandfather was dead, when a little boy was born, soon after the publication of the Sermon; but there was another letter of exhortation from the grandfather, more stringent and admonitory than ever, now that there was a boy to be guarded from the snares of the world. He described all the various sins into which men might fall, until I wondered how any man ever came to a natural death. The gallows seemed as if it must have been the termination of the lives of most of the grandfather's friends and acquaintance; and I was not surprised at the way in which he spoke of this life being "a vale of tears."

It seemed curious that I should never have heard of this brother before; but I concluded that he had died young; or else surely his name would have been alluded to by his sisters. By-and-bye we came to packets of Miss Jenkyns's letters. These, Miss Matey did regret to burn. She said all the others had been only interesting to those who loved the writers: and that it seemed as if it would have hurt her to allow them to fall into the hands of strangers, who had not known her dear mother, and how good she was, although she did not always spell quite in the modern fashion; but Deborah's letters were so very superior! Any one might profit by reading them. It was a long time since she had read Mrs. Chapone: but she knew she used to think Deborah could have said the same things quite as well; and as for Mrs Carter! people thought a deal of her letters, just because she had written Epictetus, but she was quite sure Deborah would never have made use of such a common expression as "I canna be fashed!"

Miss Matey did grudge burning these letters, it was evident. She would not let them be carelessly passed over with any quiet reading, and skipping, to myself. She took them from me, and even lighted the second candle in order to read them aloud with a proper emphasis, and without stumbling over the big words. Oh dear! how I wanted facts instead of reflections, before those letters were concluded! They lasted us two nights: and I won't deny that I made use of the time to think of many other things, and yet I was always at my post at the end of each sentence. The rector's letters, and those of his wife and mother-in-law, had all been tolerably short and pithy, written in a straight hand, with the lines very close together. Sometimes the whole letter was contained on a mere scrap of paper. The paper was very yellow, and the ink very brown; some of the sheets were (as Miss Matey made me observe) the old original *Post*, with the stamp in the corner, representing a post-poy riding for life and twanging his horn. The letters of Mrs. Jenkyns and her mother fastened with a great round red wafer: for it was before Miss Edgeworth's "Patronage" had banished wafers from polite society. It was evident from the tenor of what was said, that frances were in great request, and were even used as means of paying debts by needy members of Parliament. The rector sealed his epistles with an immense coat of arms, and showed by the care with which he had performed this ceremony that he expected they should be cut open, not broken by any thoughtless or impatient hand. Now, Miss Jenkyns's letters were of a later date in form and writing. She wrote on the square sheet which we have learned to call old-fashioned. Her hand was admirably calculated, together with her use of many syllabled words, to fill up a sheet, and then came the pride and delight of crossing. Poor Miss Matey got sadly puzzled with this, for the words gathered size like snow-balls and toward the end of her letter, Miss Jenkyns used to become quite sesquipedalian. In one to her father, slightly theological and controvertial in its tone, she had spoken of Herod, Tetrarch of Idumea. Miss Matey read it "Herod Petraeh of Etrurice," and was just as well pleased as if she had been right. I can't quite remember the date, but I think it was in 1805, that Miss Jenkyns wrote the longest series of letters, on occasion of her absence on a visit to some friends near Newcastle-upon-Tyne. These friends were intimate with the commandant of the garrison there, and heard from him of all the preparations that were being made to repel the invasion of Bonaparte, which some people imagined might take place at the mouth of the Tyne. Miss Jenkyns was evidently very much alarmed; and the first part of her letters was often written in pretty intelligible English, conveying particulars of the preparations which were made in the family with whom she was residing against the dreaded event; the bundles of clothes that were packed up ready for a flight to Alston Moor (a wild, hilly piece of ground between Northumberland and Cumberland); the signal that was to be given for this flight, and for the simultaneous turning out of the volunteers under arms; which said signal was to consist (if I remember rightly) in ringing the church bells in a particular and ominous manner. This warning summons was actually given, one day, when Miss Jenkyns and her hosts were at a dinner-party in Newcastle, (not a very wise proceeding, if there be any truth in the moral attached to the fable of the Boy and the Wolf; but so it was,) and Miss Matey Jenkyns hardly recovered from her fright, wrote the next day to describe the sound, the breathless shock, the hurry and alarm; and then, taking breath, she added, "How trivial, my dear father, do all our apprehensions of the last evening appear at the present moment, to calm and enquiring minds!" And here Miss Matey broke in with—"But, indeed, my dear, they were not at all trivial or trifling at the time. I know I used to wake up in the night many a time, and think I heard the tramp of the French entering Cranford. My mother sat by my bed half a night through, holding my hand and comforting me; and many people talked of hiding themselves in the saltmines; and meat would have kept capitally down there, only perhaps we should have been thirsty, and my father preached a whole set of sermons on the occasion; one set in the mornings, all about David and Goliath, to spirit up the people to fighting with spades, or bricks, if need were: and the other set in the Afternoon, proving that Napoleon (that was another name for Bony, as we used to call him) was all the same as Apollyon and Abaddon. I remember, my father rather thought he should be asked to print this last set; but the parish had, perhaps, had enough of them with hearing."

Peter Marmaduke Arley Jenkyns, ("poor Peter!" as Miss Matey began to call him) was at school at Shrewsbury by this time. The rector took up his pen, and rubbed up his Latin, once more, to correspond with his boy. It was very clear that the lad's were what are called show-letters. They were of a highly mental description, giving an account of his studies, and his intellectual hopes of various kinds, with an occasional quotation from the classics; but now and then, the animal nature broke out in such a little sentence as this, evidently written in a trembling hurry, after the letter had been inspected: "Mother, dear, do send me a cake, and put plenty of citron in." The "mother, dear," probably answered her boy in the form of cakes and "goody," for there were none of her letters among this sect; but a whole collection of the rector's, to whom the Latin boy's letters was like a trumpet to the old warhorse. I do not know much about Latin, certainly, and it is, perhaps, an ornamental language; but not very useful, I think—at least to judge from the bits I remember out of the rector's letters. One was: "You have not got that town in your map of Ireland; but *Bonus Bernardus non videt omnia*, as the Proverbia say." Presently it became very evident that "poor Peter" got himself into many scrapes. There were letters of stilted penitence to his father, for some wrong-doing; and, among them all, was a badly-written, badly-sealed, badly-directed, blotted note—"My dear, dear, dear, dearest mother, I will indeed; but don't, please, be ill for me; I am not worth it: but I will be good, darling mother."

Miss Matey could not speak for crying, after she had read this note. She gave it to me in silence, and then got up and took it to her sacred recesses in her own room, for fear, by any chance, it might get burnt. "Poor Peter!" she said; "he was always in scrapes; he was too easy. They led him wrong, and then left him in the lurch. But he was too fond of mischief. He could never resist a joke. Poor Peter!"

Poor Peter's career lay before him rather pleasantly, mapped out by kind friends, but *Bonus Bernardus non videt omnia* in this map, too. He was to win honours at Shrewsbury School, and carry them thick to Cambridge, and after that, a living awaited him, the gift of his godfather, Sir Peter Arley. Poor Peter! his lot in life was very different to what his friends had hoped and planned. Miss Matey told me all about it, and I think it was a relief to her when she had done so. He was the darling of his mother, who seemed to dote on all her children, though she was, perhaps, a little afraid of Deborah's superior acquirements. Deborah was the favourite of her father, and when Peter disappointed him, she became his pride. The sole honour Peter brought away from Shrewsbury, was the reputation of being the best good fellow that ever was, and of being the captain of the school in the art of practical joking. His father was disappointed, but set about remedying the matter in a manly way. He could not afford to send Peter to read with any tutor, but he could read with him himself; and Miss Matey told me much of the awful preparations in the way of dictionaries and lexicons that were made in her father's study the morning Peter began.

"My poor mother!" said she. "I remember how she used to stand in the hall, just near enough to the study-door to catch the tone of my father's voice. I could tell, in a moment, if all was going right, by her face. And it did go right for a long time."

"What went wrong at last?" said I. "That tiresome Latin, I dare say."

"No! it was not the Latin. Peter was in high favour with my father, for he worked up well for him. But he seemed to think that the Cranford people might be joked about, and made fun of, and they did not like it; nobody does. He was always hoaxing them; 'hoaxing' is not a pretty word, my dear, and I hope you won't tell your father I used it; for I should not like him to think that I was not choice in my language, after living with such a woman as Deborah. And be sure you never use it yourself. I don't know how it slipped out of my mouth, except that I was thinking of poor Peter, and it was always his expression. But he was a very gentlemanly boy in many things. He was like dear Captain Brown in always being ready to help any old person or a child. Still, he did like joking and making fun: and he seemed to think the old ladies in Cranford would believe anything. There were many old ladies living here then; we are principally ladies now, I know; but we are not so old as the ladies used to be when I was a girl. I could laugh to think of some of Peter's jokes. No! my dear I won't tell of them, because they might not shock you as they ought to do; and they were very shocking. He even took in my father once, by dressing himself up as a lady who was passing through the town, and wished to see the Rector of Cranford, who had published that admirable assize sermon. Peter said he was awfully frightened himself when he saw how my father took it all in, and even offered to copy out all his Napoleon Bonaparte sermons for her—him, I mean—no, her, for Peter was a lady then. He told me he was more terrified than he ever was before, all the time my father was speaking. He did not think my father would have believed him; and yet, if he had not, it would have been a sad thing for Peter. As it was, he was none so glad of it, for my father kept him hard at work copying out those twelve Bonaparte sermons for the lady—that was for Peter himself, you know. He was the lady. And once, when he wanted to go fishing, Peter said, 'Confound the woman!'—very bad language, my dear; but Peter was not always as guarded as he should have been; but my father was so angry with him, it nearly frightened me out of my wits; and yet I could hardly keep from laughing at the little curtsies Peter kept making, quite slyly, whenever my father spoke of the lady's excellent taste and sound discrimination."

"Did Miss Jenkyns know of these tricks?" said I.

"Oh no! Deborah would have been too much shocked. No! no one knew but I. I wish I had always known of Peter's plans; but sometimes he did not tell me. He used to say the old ladies in the town wanted something to talk about; but I don't think they did. They had the *St. James's Chronicle* three times a week, just as we have now—the very same advantages we have, and we have plenty to say; and I remember the clacking noise there always was when some of the ladies got together. But, probably, school-boys talk more than ladies. At last there was a terrible sad thing happened." Miss Matey got up, went to the door and opened it; no one was there. She rang the bell for Martha; and when Martha came, her mistress told her to go for eggs to a farm at the other end of the town.

"I will lock the door after you, Martha. You are not afraid to go, are you?"

"No, ma'am, not at all; Jem Hearn will be only too proud to go with me."

Miss Matey drew herself up, and, as soon as we were alone, she wished that Martha had more maidenly reserve.

"We'll put out the candle, my dear. We can talk just as well by fire-light, you know. There! well! you see, Deborah had gone from home for a fortnight; it was a very still, quiet day, I remember, overhead; and the lilacs were all in flower, so I suppose it was spring. My father had gone out to see some sick people in the parish; I recollect seeing him leave the house, with his wig, and shovel-hat, and cane. What possessed our poor Peter, I don't know; he had the sweetest temper, and yet he always seemed to like to plague Deborah. She never laughed at his jokes, and thought him ungenteel, and not careful enough about improving his mind; and that vexed him.

"Well! he went to her room, it seems, and dressed himself in her old gown, and shawl, and bonnet; just the things she used to wear in Cranford, and was known by everywhere; and he made the pillow into a little—you are sure you locked the door, my dear, for I should not like any one to hear—into—into—a little baby, with white long clothes. It was only, as he told me afterwards, to make something to talk about in the town, he never thought of it as affecting Deborah. And he went and walked up and down in the Filbert walk, just halt hidden by the rails, and half seen; and he cuddled his pillow, just like a baby: and talked to it all the nonsense people do. Oh dear! and my father came stepping stately up the street, as he always did; and what should he see but a little black crowd of people—I dare say as many as twenty—all peeping through his garden rails. So he thought, at first, they were only looking at a new rhododendrons that was in full bloom, and that he was very proud of; and he walked slower, that they might have more time to admire. And he wondered if he could make out a sermon from the occasion, and thought, perhaps, there was some relation between the rhododendrons and the lillies of the field. My poor father! When he came nearer, he began to wonder that they did not see him; but their heads were all so close together, peeping and peeping! My father was amongst them, meaning, he said, to ask them to walk into the garden with him, and admire the beautiful vegetable production, when—oh, my dear! I tremble to think of it, he looked through the rails himself, and saw—I don't know what he thought he saw, but old Clare told me his face went quite grey-white with anger, and his eyes blazed out under his frowning black brows; and he spoke out—oh, so terribly! and bade them all stop where they were—not one of them to go, not one to stir a step; and, swift as light, he was in at the garden door, and down the Filbert walk, and seized hold of poor Peter, and tore his clothes off his back—bonnet, shawl, gown, and all—and threw the pillow among the people over the railings; and then he was very, very angry, indeed; and before all the people he lifted up his cane, and flogged Peter! My dear! that boy's trick, on that sunny day, when all seemed going straight and well, broke my mother's heart, and changed my father for life. It did, indeed. Old Clare said, Peter looked as white as my father; and stood as still as a statue to be flogged; and my father struck hard! When my father stopped to take breath, Peter said, 'Have you done enough sir?' quite hoarsely, and still standing quite quiet. I don't know what my father said—or if he said anything. But old Clare said Peter turned to where the people outside the railing were, and made them a low bow, as grand and as grave as any gentleman; and then walked slowly into the house. I was in the store-room, helping my mother to make cowslip-wine. I cannot abide the wine now, nor the scent of the flowers; they turn me sick and faint as they did that day, when Peter came in, looking as haughty as any man—indeed, looking like a man, not like a boy. 'Mother!' he said, 'I am come to say, God bless you for ever.' I saw his lips quiver, as he spoke; and I think he durst not say anything more loving, for the purpose that was in his heart. She looked at him rather frightened, and wondering, and asked him what was to do? He did not smile or speak, but put his arms round her, and kissed her as if he did not know how to leave off; and before she could speak again, he was gone. We talked it over, and could not understand it, and she bade me go and seek my father, and ask what it was all about. I found him walking, up and down, looking very highly displeased.

"'Tell your mother I have flogged Peter, and that he richly deserved it.'

"I durst not ask any more questions. When I told my mother, she sat down, quite faint, for a minute. I remember, a few days after, I saw the poor withered cowslip flowers thrown out to the leaf-heap, to decay and die there. There was no making of cowslip-wine that year at the Rectory, nor, indeed, ever after. Presently, my mother went to my father. I know I thought of Queen Esther and King Ahasuerus; for my mother was very pretty and delicate-looking, and my father looked as terrible as King Ahasuerus. Some time after, they came out together; and then my mother told me what had happened, and that she was going up to Peter's room, at my father's desire—though she was not to tell Peter this—to talk the matter over with him. But no Peter was there. We looked over the house; no Peter was there! Even my father, who had not liked to join in the search at first, helped us before long. The Rectory was a very old house; steps up into a room; steps down into a room, all through. At first, my mother went calling low and soft—as if to reassure the poor boy—Peter! Peter, dear! it's only me;' but, bye-and-bye, as the servants came back from the errands my father had sent them, in different directions, to find where Peter was—as we found he was not in the garden, nor the hay-loft, nor anywhere about—my mother's cry grew louder and wilder—'Peter! Peter, my darling! where are you?' for then she felt and understood that that long kiss meant some sad kind of 'good-bye.' The afternoon went on, my mother never resting, but seeking again and again in every possible place that had been looked into twenty times before: nay, that she had looked into over and over again herself. My father sat with his head in his hands, not speaking except when his messengers came in, bringing no tidings; then he lifted up his face so strong and sad, and told them to go again in some new direction. My mother kept passing from room to room, in and out of the house, moving noiselessly, but never ceasing. Neither she nor my father durst leave the house, which was the meeting-place for all the messengers. At last (and it was nearly dark), my father rose up. He took hold of my mother's arm, as she came with wild, sad pace through one door, and quickly towards another. She started at the touch of his hand, for she had forgotten all in the world but Peter.

"'Molly!' said she, 'I did not think all this would happen.' He looked into her face for comfort—her poor face all wild and white; for neither she nor my father had dared to acknowledge—much less act upon—the terror that was in their hearts, lest Peter should have made away with himself. My father saw no conscious look in his wife's hot, dreary eyes, and he missed the sympathy that she had always been ready to give him, strong man as he was; and at the dumb despair in her face, his tears began to flow. But when she saw this, a gentle sorrow came over her countenance, and she said, 'dearest John! don't cry; come with me, and we'll find him,' almost as cheerfully as if she knew where he was; and she took my father's great hand in her little soft one, and led him along, the tears dropping, as he walked on that same unceasing, weary walk, from room to room, through house and garden. Oh! how I wished for Deborah! I had no time for crying, for now, all seemed to depend on me. I wrote for Deborah to come home. I sent a message privately to that same Mr. Holbrook's—poor Mr. Holbrook!—you know who I mean. For at one time, Mr. Holbrook was an occasional visitor at the Rectory—you know he was Miss Pole's cousin—and he had been very kind to Peter, and taught him how to fish——he was very kind to everybody, and I thought Peter might have gone off there. But Mr. Holbrook was from home, and Peter had never been seen. It was night now: but the doors were all wide open, and my father and mother walked on and on; and it was more than an hour since he had joined her, and I don't believe they had ever spoken all that time. I was getting the parlour fire lighted, and one of the servants was preparing tea, for I wanted them to have something to eat and drink and warm them, when old Clare asked to speak to me.

"I have borrowed the nets from the weir, Miss Matey. Shall we drag the ponds to-night, or wait for the morning?'

"I remember staring in his face to gather his meaning; and when I did, I laughed out loud. The horror of that new thought—our bright, darling Peter, cold, and stark, and dead! I remember the ring of my own laugh now.

"The next day Deborah was at home before I was myself again. She would not have been so weak to give way as I had done: but my screams (my horrible laughter had ended in crying) had roused my sweet dear mother, whose poor wandering wits were called back and collected, as soon as a child needed her care. She and Deborah sat by my bedside; I knew by the looks of each that there had been no news of Peter—no awful, ghastly news, which was what I most dreaded in my dull state between sleeping and wakening. The same result of all the searching had brought something of the same relief to my mother, to whom, I am sure, the thought that Peter might even then be hanging dead in some of the familiar home places, had caused that never-ending walk of yesterday. Her soft eyes never were the same again after that; they had always a restless, craving look, as if seeking for what they could not find. Oh! it was an awful time; coming down like a thunderbolt on the still sunny day, when lilacs were all in bloom."

"Where was Mr. Peter?" said I.

"He had made his way to Liverpool; and there was war then; and some of the king's ships lay off the mouth of the Mersey; and they were only too glad to have a fine likely boy such as him (five foot nine he was) come to offer himself. The captain wrote to my father, and Peter wrote to my mother. Stay! those letters will be somewhere here."

We lighted the candle, and found the captain's letter, and Peter's too. And we also found a little simple begging-letter from Mrs. Jenkyns to Peter, addressed to him at the house of an old school-fellow, whither she fancied he might have gone. They had returned it unopened; and unopened it had remained ever since, having been inadvertently put by among the other letters of that time. This is it:

"My dearest Peter,

"You did not think we should be sorry as we are, I know, or you would never have gone away. You are too good. Your father sits and sighs till my heart aches to hear him. He cannot hold up his head for grief; and yet he only did what he thought was right. Perhaps he has been too severe, and perhaps I have not been kind enough; but God knows how we love you, my dear only boy. Dor looks so sorry you are gone. Come back, and make us happy, who love you so much. I *know* you will come back."

But Peter never came back. That spring day was the last time he ever saw father or mother. The writer of the letter—the last—the only person who had ever seen what was written in it, was dead long ago—and I, a stranger, not born at the time when this occurrence took place, was the one to open it.

The captain's letter summoned the father and mother to Liverpool instantly, if they wished to see their boy; and by some of the wild chances of life, the captain's letter had been detained somewhere, somehow. Miss Matey went on: "And it was race-time, and all the post-horses at Cranford were gone to the races; but my father and mother set off in our own gig—and, oh! my dear, they were too late—the ship was gone. And now read Peter's letter to my mother."

It was full of love, and sorrow, and prides in his new profession, and a sore sense of his disgrace in the eyes of the people at Cranford; but ending with a passionate entreaty that she would come and see him before he left the Mersey: "Mother! we may go into battle. I hope we shall, and lick those French: but I must see you again before that time!"

"And she was too late," said Miss Matey; "too late!"

We sat in silence, pondering on the full meaning of those sad, sad words. At length I asked Miss Matey to tell me how her mother bore it.

"Oh!" she said, "she was patience itself. She had never been strong, and this weakened her terribly. My father used to sit looking at her: far more sad than she was. He seemed as if he could look at nothing else when she was by; and she was so humble—so very gentle, now. He would, perhaps, speak in his old way—laying down the law, as it were—and, then in a minute or two, he would come round and put his hand on our shoulders, and ask us in a low voice if he said anything to hurt us? I did not wonder at his speaking so to Deborah, for she was so clever; but I could not bear to hear him talking so to me.

"But, you see, he saw what we did not—that it was killing my mother. Yes! killing her—(put out the candle my dear! I can talk better in the dark)—for she was but a frail woman, and ill fitted to stand the fright and shock she had gone through; and she would smile at him, and comfort him, not in words, but in her looks and tones, which were always cheerful when he was there. And she would speak of how she thought Peter stood a good chance of being Admiral very soon—he was so brave and clever; and how she thought of seeing him in his navy uniform, and what sort of hats admirals wore, and how much more fit he was to be a sailor than a clergyman; and all in that way, just to make my father think she was quite glad of what came of that unlucky morning's work, and the flogging which was always in his mind, as we all knew. But, Oh, my dear! the bitter, bitter crying she had when she was alone; and at last, as she grew weaker, she could not keep her tears in, when Deborah or me was by, and would give us message after message for Peter, (his ship had gone to the Mediterranean, or somewhere down there, and then he was ordered off to India, and there was no overland route then); but she still said that no one knew where their death lay in wait, and that we were not to think hers was near. We did not think it, but we knew it, as we saw her fading away.

"Well, my dear, it's very foolish of me, I know, when in all likelihood I am so near seeing her again." But Miss Matey was not foolish, poor dear thing!

"And only think, love! the very day after her death—for she did not live quite a twelvemonth after Peter went away—the very day after—came a parcel for her from India—from her poor boy. It was a large soft, white India shawl, with just a little narrow border all around; just what my mother would have liked. We thought it might rouse my father, for he had sat with her hand in his all night long; so Deborah took it into him, and Peter's letter to her, and all. At first, he took no notice; and we tried to make a kind of light careless talk about the shawl, opening it out and admiring it. Then, suddenly, he got up and spoke: 'She shall be buried in it,' he said; 'Peter shall have that comfort; and she would have liked it.' Well! perhaps it was not reasonable, but what could we do or say? One gives people in grief their own way. He took it up and felt it—'It is just such a shawl as she wished for when she was married, and her mother did not give it her. I did not know of it till after, or she should have had it—she should; but she shall have it now.'

"My mother looked so lovely in her death! She was always pretty, and now she looked fair, and waxen, and young—younger than Deborah, as she stood trembling and shivering by her. We decked her in the long soft folds: she lay, smiling, as if pleased: and people came—all Cranford came—to beg to see her, for they had loved her dearly—as well they might; and the country-women brought posies; old Clare's wife brought some white violet's, and begged they might lie on her breast.

"Deborah said to me, the day of my mother's funeral, that if she had a hundred offers, she never would marry and leave my father. It was not very likely she would have so many—I don't know that she had one; but it was not less to her credit to say so. She was such a daughter to my father, as I think there never was, before or since. His eyes failed him, and she read book after book, and wrote, and copied, and was always at his service in any parish business. She could do many more things than my poor mother could; she even once wrote a letter to the bishop for my father. But he missed my mother sorely; the whole parish noticed it. Not that he was less active; I think he was more so, and more patient in helping every one. I did all I could to set Deborah at liberty to be with him; for I knew I was good for little, and that my best work in the world was to do odd jobs quietly, and set others at liberty. But my father was a changed man."

"Did Mr. Peter ever come home?"

"Yes, once. He came home a Lieutenant; he did not get to be Admiral. And he and my father were such friends! My father took him into every house in the parish, he was so proud of him. He never walked out without Peter's arm to lean upon. Deborah used to smile, (I don't think we ever laughed again after my mother's death,) and say she was quite put in a corner. Not but what my father always wanted her when there was letter writing, or reading, to be done, or anything to be settled."

"And then?" said I, after a pause.

"Then Peter went to sea again; and by-and-bye my father died, blessing us both, and thanking Deborah for all she had been to him; and, of course, our circumstances were changed; and, instead of living at the Rectory, and keeping three maids and a man, we had to come to this small house, and be content with a servant-of-all-work; but, as Deborah used to say, we have always lived genteelly, even if circumstances have compelled us to simplicity. Poor Deborah!"

"And Mr. Peter?" asked I.

"Oh, there was some great war in India—I forget what they call it—and we have never heard of Peter since then. I believe he is dead, myself; and it sometimes fidgets me that we have never put on mourning for him. And then, again, when I sit by myself, and all the house it still, I think I hear his step coming up the street, and my heart begins to flutter and beat; but the sound always goes past—and Peter never comes.

That's Martha back? No? I'll go, my dear; I can always find my way back in the dark, you know. And a blow of fresh air at the door will do my head good, and it's rather got a trick of aching." So she pattered off. I had lighted the candle, to give the room a cheerful appearance against her return.

"Was it Martha?" asked I.

"Yes. And I am rather uncomfortable, for I heard such a strange noise just as I was opening the door."

"When?" I asked, for her eyes were round with affright.

"In the street—just outside—it sounded like—"

"Talking?" I put in, as she hesitated a little.

"No! kissing—"—*Dickens' Household Words.*

Every heart has its secret sorrow, which the world knows not; and oftentimes we call a man cold when he is only sad.

### SINGULAR LITERARY FORGERIES IN ENGLAND.

THE Shelley Letters, published by Mr. Moxon, and reviewed in our paper a fortnight since, are, it turns out, with but one or two exceptions, forgeries. It is proper to say at once that Mr. Moxon has been deceived, and that no gentleman, from the moment of the discovery, could have acted more straightforwardly and promptly than he has done in this transaction. As soon as he was convinced that he had been the means—the innocent means—of giving to the public a false article, he did his best to repair his mistake. He has suppressed the book, and has called in the copies delivered to the trade.

The discovery was made in quite an accidental manner. Mr. Moxon had sent a copy of the book to Mr. Tennyson. During a visit which Mr. Palgrave was paying to Mr. Tennyson, he dipped into the Shelley volume, and lighted on a letter written from Florence to Godwin, the better half of which he at once recognised as part of an article on Florence, written for the *Quarterly Review*, so far back as 1840, by his father, Sir Francis Palgrave. It is good to find a son so well versed in the writings of his father as young Mr. Palgrave proved himself to be on this occasion. He lost no time, as we may suppose, in communicating his curious discovery to his father; and Sir Francis, after comparing the printed letter with the printed article, wrote at once to Mr. Moxon, informing him that the letter, by whomsoever written, was a "crib" from an article which he had written for the *Quarterly Review*.

Startled at such intelligence, Mr. Moxon replied, that he had bought the letter at a public sale, among other letters also by Shelley, and that the passage of which Sir Francis claimed the authorship was contained in a letter written by Shelly, carrying upon it the post-mark of the period and other written signs, which apparently marked it to be genuine. The Deputy Keeper of the Public Records was, it may be readily imagined, equally startled with Mr. Moxon at the announcement of such a fact. He wanted to see the letter. The letter was produced. "It looks genuine—